This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600094905X

300094905X

600084905X

THE CANON

OF

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

FROM THE DOUBLE POINT OF VIEW

OF SCIENCE AND OF FAITH.

BY

L. GAUSSEN, D.D.

GENEVA.

LONDON:

JAMES NISBET AND CO., 21 BERNERS STREET.

M.DCCC.LXII.

100. f. 25.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY,
PAUL'S WORK.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following translation from the French has been carefully revised by the learned and venerable Author; and most of the quotations from the Fathers of the Church and ecclesiastical writers have again been verified by a comparison with the original works.

600094905X

PREFACE.

In publishing this work, I am actuated by the threefold consideration—of the real importance of the subject, of its being accessible to every class of readers, and of the very luminous aspect it presents when closely studied. It is only obscure at a distance; and if to some persons it seems beset with difficulty and uncertainty, it is only owing to their imperfect knowledge, or bad method of studying it. I was not aware that it was so intelligible till I had examined it with great attention.

For this reason I thought it my duty, in consequence of the very numerous and severe attacks made on the certainty of the canon, to treat it at large for the use of our theological students; and since that I have felt it desirable to introduce it to the knowledge of our churches.

With this view I have endeavoured to write a book that will be sufficiently intelligible to every serious reader; and it has been my desire, that all unlettered Christians who may have been disturbed by these attacks of modern infidelity, may feel themselves, on reading it, confirmed in their faith.

It is impossible to treat such a subject usefully,—at least from an historical point of view,—without adducing numerous testimonies from the fathers, with quotations from their writings, both Greek and Latin. But I have made it a rule always to translate those passages, and never to appeal to any of the ancient doctors,

either of the West or East, without giving some brief notice of his character, his principal writings, and his place in history.

I publish these volumes as a complement of that which I brought out, almost twenty years ago, on the inspiration of the Scriptures. That work would have been incomplete unless accompanied by a treatise on the canon; for its readers, even those who were most thoroughly convinced, might always object, after having heard me prove by all Scripture that all Scripture was divinely inspired, that it still remained to be proved whether Daniel, or Esther, or Canticles, or any other book of the Old Testament, belonged to this inspired Scripture—whether the Epistle of Jude, or that of James, or the Second Epistle of Peter, or the Second and Third of John, or any other book commonly included in the New Testament, legitimately formed a part of it—or whether there was sufficient certainty that all the apocryphal books ought to be absolutely excluded.

As long as these questions are not clearly solved, our privilege of possessing an inspired Bible remains illusory, or is at least compromised; we have a feeling of insecurity in its use; we cannot clearly discern all its pages; a depressing cloud of uncertainty floats over our heads between heaven and earth; and though carrying in our hands a volume denominated *the Scriptures*, we proceed with tottering steps.

But, blessed be God! my Christian brethren, this is not your position; the God of the holy prophets has prepared better things for His believing people.

Your proofs are abundant, and, as we are about to shew, you have also divine guarantees. If your confidence in those Scriptures, which constitute the rule and joy of your faith, rests, on one side, on the most solid human reasons, on the other, it is invited to support itself by the strongest divine reasons. On the one hand, there are facts, documents, monuments, historical testimonies—testimonies clear, numerous, certain, and sufficient—such as no human composition under heaven ever possessed. On the other hand, you have something still more simple and abso-

When we founded in Geneva, twenty-nine years ago, a School of Theology, for the purpose of elevating the long-depressed banner of the Saviour's divinity, and the great doctrines connected with it, in the Church of our fathers, I charged myself with the doctrinal instruction. But, in performing my task, I felt no need for many years of discussing to any extent either the canonicity or divine inspiration of the Scriptures.

We attended to what was most urgent, and those truths had not then been publicly called in question by any person in our immediate vicinity. As to myself, in my early years, and during my studies, though very anxious to settle my faith on a satisfactory basis, I never experienced any wavering on these two points. Since Jesus Christ, my Lord and my God, "created all things in heaven and earth, and by him all things subsist," (Col. i. 16,) I said to myself, how could I doubt that He has taken care of His own revelations, whether in giving them at first, or in their subsequent preservation and transmission? Our only business was to study them for the purpose of regulating each one's faith, and conscience, and life. Besides, we invited to our school none but young men who had already owned the authority of the Scriptures, and who were esteemed truly pious, as having experienced in their souls something of "the good word of God and the powers of the world to come."

We directed our attention in the first place, as I have said, to what was most urgent; we were eager to reach those vital truths, on the reception of which the stability of a church depends, and without which it falls.

Mere logical arrangement would have led us to give every question its exact place in a course of theology; but it was evident that the greatest attention should be given to those doctrines which had been long disregarded, and too often assailed, which convince men of sin, lead to the feet of Jesus, and keep them there,—I mean, the divinity of the Son of man and His everlasting priesthood, the fall of humanity and its entire ruin, the election of believers from all eternity, their redemption by

written Word, make this a duty on our part, almost a necessity. In former times this need was not felt among us, as may be easily inferred from the very small space allotted to these questions by our best theological writers—Calvin, Francis Turretine, Pictet, and Stapfer, in their largest and most accredited treatises. But in the present day a great change has come over us, and we are condemned to see a totally novel warfare, no longer carried on from without against the Scriptures, but from within, and by men who profess to be, like ourselves, representatives of Christianity.

This kind of warfare is very pernicious; our fathers were not acquainted with it, or, at least, it never assailed them, excepting by short skirmishes, or by isolated attacks on one or other of our sacred books. In the present day the enemy is drawn up in battle-array against the whole of the Scriptures. Since the first third of the nineteenth century, we have seen almost all the opponents of the living truth vie with each other in efforts, not only, as heretofore, against this or the other vital doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, but against the depository of them all. For a time they leave undisturbed the distinctive teachings of the written Word as beneath their notice, in order to attack the volume in which God has given them to us. It is no longer the contents that are put upon their trial; of these our opponents think they can easily get rid, if they succeed in accomplishing the task of discrediting and demolishing the Scriptures. Their aim is directed against the depository, the entire volume, of revelation. Nothing is neglected which may render it suspected, uncertain, contradictory, mean, and tainted with error;—in a word, contemptible as a whole and in all its parts. They will deny its authority, its inspiration, its integrity; they will deny the canonicity of each book;—in short, they will deny its authenticity, its veracity, its good sense, and even its morality!

But the most novel feature of this warfare, the most ill-omened, the most threatening in its immediate effect on our churches, and one which never appeared but in the second and third centuries,

is that this crusade against the Scriptures is carried on in the name of a certain kind of Christianity.

During thirty-three centuries, was a man of God ever seen decrying the Scriptures of God, a pious Israelite decrying the Old Testament, or a Christian decrying the books of the men (the apostles and prophets) who wrote the New Testament? No; this was never seen!

"The righteous man," in all ages, has always distinguished himself from the rest of mankind by his reverence for the Sacred Volume; and a true Christian, from the moment of his new birth, has always thirsted for it, as an infant for its mother's milk, to sustain and strengthen him. It is an apostolic injunction, "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby," (1 Pet. ii. 2.)

"The righteous man," David said twenty-nine centuries ago, "takes his delight in this holy law, and he meditates in it day and night," (Ps. i. 2.) By this sign he is recognised in the present day; by this sign he has been recognised in all ages of the world. "O how I love Thy law! it is my meditation all the day;" "it is sweeter than honey to my mouth." "I love Thy commandments above gold;" "the entrance of Thy word giveth light; it maketh wise the simple." "God has magnified his word above all his name."[1]

But in the present day, by whom is this warfare against the Scriptures carried on? "Behold, heaven and earth, and be astonished!"

In former ages, and for 1600 years, such attacks proceeded only from the most inveterate enemies of the Christian name. The present times remind us of the disastrous days of those ancient Gnostics who caused such grief to the faithful ministers of the second century. In our day these attacks come from persons whom men of the world might suppose to belong to our own ranks,—persons who call themselves members of a Protestant church, and are in many instances ministers of the Word. They

[1] Ps. cxix. 97, 103, 127, 130, cxxxviii. 2.

profess to speak in the name of science, and to attack our Scriptures only to defend the interests of a Christ whom they have made, and of divine truth shaped in accordance with their own conceptions.

And yet, what do we know in religion unless by means of the Bible, and what do they themselves know? Let one of our opponents point out a truth,—yes! only a single truth relating to God the Father, or to His only Son, to the eternal Spirit, to the resurrection of the dead, to the future world, to the last judgment, to heaven or hell or immortality,—yes! I say a single truth which their philosophy has gained, or which has been discovered in their school independently of the oracles of God. But men of this stamp pervert all the principles of religion, as Calvin remarks, "by quitting the Scriptures to go in chase of their own fancies."[1]

"God hath made foolish the wisdom of this world," says St Paul; "for after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," (1 Cor. i. 19–21.)

It is this book of "the preaching" which alone has changed the face of the world. It alone causes a soul to pass from death into life. It alone, in these latter days, has brought more than one tribe of cannibals out of darkness into light. Let them shew us any other volume—from the times of Confucius, Plato, or Aristotle, to those of Mohammed, (apart from his sword,) Voltaire, Bayle, Rousseau, Hegel, or Cousin—which has ever, in any country, reclaimed, by its science, its morals, or its philosophy, a village, only a single village, from idolatry to the service of God.

Is it not written, "Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? (*Ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς;*)" Where are they, and what have they done? This is the interrogation of the apostle.[2]

The warfare carried on in our days against the Scriptures is as strange as it is pernicious, and the friends of God ought to be

[1] Institution Chrétiènne, tom. i., p. 34. Paris, 1859.
[2] 1 Cor. i. 19, 20.

that heard it." But how, I ask—how can the word preached to our Protestant populations be *mixed with faith* in minds to whom it will appear suspicious and contemptible, in consequence of the disparaging terms applied to the oracles of God, and the flat contradictions given to their contents? What! (it will be said to them,) do you believe that this collection of scriptures which is offered you is indeed from God? Do you not know that the books of which it consists are of an uncertain number?—that some are apocryphal, some are doubtful, some are absolute forgeries? And again, of those which may be authentic, do you imagine that every part is inspired? Contradictions are palpable in them, errors abound, and the prejudices of the age may be detected page after page! . . . .

How, I ask, can the word be "mixed with faith" among the persons who are, unhappily, exposed to these suggestions of the tempter, and filled by him with prejudices and feelings of contempt against the Scriptures? No! these "profane and vain babblings," as the apostle says, "overthrow the faith" of many; or, rather, they prevent its birth; they render it impossible!

Will it be said that the Scripture cannot be destitute of power? Is it not powerful, by its divine energy, "to cast down in the human heart every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God?" Is it not "a hammer breaking the rock in pieces?" Is it not "a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder the joints and marrow?" Yes; it is all this; but only for those who hear it, and who expect to gain something from it. And how can it be all this for those who despise it, and do not believe that it comes from God? Without reverence, there can be no attention; and without attention, no means of being touched; and without all this, there can be no faith, no communion possible with God, no efficacy in the blood of the cross, no salvation, no life.

And yet, as I have said, this is not all. The mischief will not be confined to those men of the world whom we have desired to

conduct to Jesus Christ, but whose prejudices keep them at a distance from Him. It will be felt in our churches, and among the most pious of our members.

It may be thought, perhaps, that these attacks will entail little danger on believers, who, nourished by the Scriptures, know by experience what they are, and what they can do. But we must not hope that it will be always so. Even for such persons, this warfare is not without its perils. Oftentimes it will lower the standard of piety and faith, by lowering in their minds the majesty of the Scriptures; for it can never be without some deteriorating effect for even those who are most confirmed in the faith to hear repeated depreciating suggestions against one and another of our sacred books, if these suggestions are not combated as often as they are brought forward. However ill-founded they may be, if repeated without being put down, they exert an enervating influence on the mind, even when, without accepting them, and yet, without having learnt how to refute them, the unfortunate habit has been acquired of letting them pass without decided opposition. Hence persons are led to believe that, while rejecting them themselves, other Christians may admit them without damaging their Christianity. These charges and obscurities respecting the canon of the Scriptures often circulated in the neighbourhood of our churches without being noticed by our sentinels, at last settle over them in the atmosphere like a pestilential miasma, which even the healthiest frames cannot pass through and inhale without some injury. Perhaps, at last, tired of resistance, and with defective information, they will come to regard these injurious reports as the distant and mysterious echoes of an unknown and superior science, which it would be rash to think of combating, or of attempting to refute.

And hence what baneful consequences! The weakening of faith; diminished taste for the study of the Scriptures; less thirst for their use; less humble submission to regulate the life by them; less labour to fathom them, and to explore their depths; less jealousy for purity of doctrine; for, as Calvin has said, "We

cannot have firm faith in a doctrine till we are persuaded, without any mixture of doubt, that God is its author."

It was in the beginning of the year 1850 that a sudden opposition against the authority and authenticity of the Scriptures first broke out at Geneva, in our own theological school, among half a score of Belgian, French, and Canadian students.

The cause of it was for us as painful as it was unexpected, and the subsequent disturbance occasioned by it in the churches was also very serious. But the school had passed through such storms more than once; it had combated them by the divine Word; and experience not less than faith had taught us to confide during the tempest in the faithfulness of the Most High, who made it serve in the final issue for the confirmation of the truth. When the calm was restored, we were able to acknowledge with gratitude that the Lord had permitted these days of trouble only to purify an institution consecrated to His service, to lead us to study more closely the foundations of our faith, and to confirm on some essential points the students and the professors, the pastors and their flocks.

The declarations of these young men were of such a nature that we should have felt it our duty on any other occasion to have dismissed them immediately from our institution. We had admitted them only to prepare them for preaching the Word of life, and if henceforth they rejected that Word—its inspiration, its authenticity, its authority—what was there in common between them and ourselves?

But we took a different view. We believed that we owed them some reparation, because the evil done to themselves had taken place when under our care, and we conceived that, under these circumstances, we ought not to send any of them away till we had taken pains by fresh efforts to bring them back, if possible, to own the authority of the Scriptures.

We took our part in this important task, and from this moment, I mean, from the beginning of the year 1850, I made it my study to point out to them the true path of faith in relation to the canon, in a series of propositions.

in the face the facts of history and the objections of science. On the contrary, we have gathered from these facts new reasons for belief,—reasons clear, manifold, and invincible.

This work would probably have appeared much sooner, had not the hand of God laid me on a bed of suffering for two years in succession by two very serious accidents, which rendered me for a long time almost incapable of continuous application.

I commend to the blessing of God, through Jesus Christ, a task out of the usual course of my studies, but undertaken for the sole object of serving Him.

May 5, 1862.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY, (Propp. 1–5,) 1

PART FIRST.

CANONICITY OF ALL THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

Definitions of the Canon, (Propp. 6–7,) 5

CHAPTER II.

The Idea of a New Testament Canon as early as the Days of the Apostles, (Propp. 8–10,) . . 6

CHAPTER III.

The Church, from the Commencement, regarded the Collection of Scriptures as a harmonic whole, (Propp. 11–13,) . . 11

CHAPTER IV.

First Formation of the Canon, (Propp. 14–23,) . . . 13

CHAPTER V.

PAGE

Oral Preaching was of necessity by some years anterior to Written Preaching, or the Gift of New Scriptures, (Prop. 24,) . . 17

CHAPTER VI.

Historical Division of the Canon into Three distinct Parts, (Propp. 25–29,) 18

CHAPTER VII.

This Threefold Division of the Canon is, moreover, warranted by the most authentic Documents of the Church, (Prop. 30,) . 20

SECTION FIRST.—Three Ante-Nicene Catalogues, (Prop. 31,) 20
SECTION SECOND.—Peshito Catalogue, (Propp. 32–36,) . 21
SECTION THIRD.—Origen's Catalogue, (Propp. 37–42,) . 25
SECTION FOURTH.—The Catalogue of Eusebius, (Propp. 43–50,) 31

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the Council of Nice and its Results, (Prop. 51,) . . . 42

SECTION FIRST.—The Council made no Decree on the Canon, (Propp. 52, 53,) 43
SECTION SECOND.—From the Date of the Council all disagreement regarding the Controverted Books ceased in all the Churches in Christendom, (Prop. 54,) . 45

CHAPTER IX.

The Eleven Authentic Catalogues of the Fourth Century, (Prop. 55,) 47

SECTION FIRST.—Unanimity of all the Catalogues as to the First Canon, the Second Canon, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, (Prop. 56,) 47
SECTION SECOND.—Catalogues of the Fathers and Catalogues of the Councils, (Prop. 57,) . . . 47

CHAPTER X.

The Nine Catalogues of the Fourth Century given by the Fathers, 48

SECTION FIRST.—Only Three of them omit the Apocalypse, (Propp. 58–63,) 48

PAGE

SECTION SECOND.—All the other Six Catalogues of the Fathers of the Fourth Century are entirely in accordance with the Canon of the Churches, (Propp. 64–77,) 54

CHAPTER XI.

Some other Catalogues, alleged to be of the Fourth Century, and agreeing with our Canon, are Apocryphal or spurious, (Prop. 78,) 67

SECTION FIRST.—Catalogue of Innocent I., (Propp. 79, 80,) 67
SECTION SECOND.—Catalogue of Damasus, (Prop. 81,) . 69
SECTION THIRD.—Catalogue of Amphilochius, (Prop. 82,) 70

CHAPTER XII.

The Two Catalogues drawn up by Councils of the Fourth Century, 71

SECTION FIRST.—Nature of their Testimony, (Propp. 83–86,) 71
SECTION SECOND.—Council of Laodicea, (Propp. 87–90,) . 73
SECTION THIRD.—The Council of Carthage, (Propp. 91–93,) 79

CHAPTER XIII.

Summary of all the Testimonies of the Fourth Century, (Prop. 94,) 82

CHAPTER XIV.

Vulgar Prejudices which a glance at these Facts ought to have removed, (Propp. 95–102,) 83

CHAPTER XV.

Inference from all the Testimonies of the First Four Centuries, (Propp. 103–106,) 90

BOOK II.

Of the First Canon—Historical Basis of its Authenticity, (Propp. 107, 108,) 93

CHAPTER I.

First Great Historical Fact—The complete and unvarying Unanimity of the Churches, (Propp. 109–112,) . . . 95

CHAPTER II.

PAGE

The Authenticity of the Twenty-two Homologoumena of the New Testament is established by incomparably stronger evidence than what exists in favour of the Authenticity of any other Book of Antiquity whatever, (Propp. 113–125,) . . 99

CHAPTER III.

Three causes, especially, produced this Providential Unanimity, . 107

SECTION FIRST.—The long career of the Apostles, (Propp. 126–134,) 107

SECTION SECOND.—The immense number of Churches at the death of the Apostles, (Propp. 135–144,) . 115

SECTION THIRD.—Anagnosis, (Propp. 145–163,) . . 123

CHAPTER IV.

The various Monuments of the Canon, ... 136

SECTION FIRST.—Four Classes of Monuments, (Prop. 164,) 136

SECTION SECOND.—The field of research, (Propp. 165–168,) 137

SECTION THIRD.—The actors and witnesses of the Two First Centuries of the Church presented in a Tabular Form, (Prop. 169,) 140

CHAPTER V.

The Testimony of the Fathers of the Second Half of the Second Century, ... 148

SECTION FIRST.—The united Testimonies of Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian, (Propp. 170–172,) . . 148

SECTION SECOND.—Seven characteristics of their Testimony, (Prop. 173,) 151

SECTION THIRD.—Tertullian, (Propp. 174–176,) . . 154

SECTION FOURTH.—Clement of Alexandria, (Propp. 177–179,) 157

SECTION FIFTH.—Irenæus, (Propp. 180–185,) . . 163

SECTION SIXTH.—Other contemporary Fathers, (Propp. 186, 187,) 176

SECTION SEVENTH.—The result of all their Testimonies, (Propp. 188–192,) 179

CHAPTER VI.

The Fragment called Muratori's, (Propp. 193–198,) . . . 186

PAGE

SECTION FIFTH.—Ignatius, his Martyrdom and Letters, (Propp. 248–253,) 254
SECTION SIXTH.—The Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, (Propp. 254–262,) 257
SECTION SEVENTH.—Inference from the Testimony of the Apostolic Fathers, (Prop. 263,) . . . 277

CHAPTER XI.

The later Writings of the New Testament attest the existence of a Canon already begun, (Propp. 264–267,) . . . 279

BOOK III.

The Second-First Canon, (Prop. 268,) 283

CHAPTER I.

The Apocalypse, ... 284
SECTION FIRST.—Its First Reception, (Propp. 269–272,) . 284
SECTION SECOND.—The Date of the Apocalypse, (Propp. 273, 274,) 287
SECTION THIRD.—The Apocalypse in the First Century, (Prop. 275,) 290
SECTION FOURTH.—Testimonies in the First Half of the Second Century, (Propp. 276–279,) 291
SECTION FIFTH.—Testimonies in the Second Half of the same Century, (Prop. 280,) 295
SECTION SIXTH.—The First Half of the Third Century, (Propp. 281–283,) 298
SECTION SEVENTH.—The Second Half of the Third Century, (Propp. 284, 285,) 303
SECTION EIGHTH.—Witnesses in the Fourth Century, (Propp. 286–289,) 304
SECTION NINTH.—Fifth Century, (Prop. 290,) . . . 308

CHAPTER II.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, ... 309
SECTION FIRST.—Its character and history, (Propp. 291–295,) 309

PAGE

SECTION SECOND.—The Testimonies of the East in the Fourth Century, (Propp. 296–299,) . . . 311
SECTION THIRD.—Witnesses of the East in the Third Century, (Prop. 300,) 313
SECTION FOURTH.—Witnesses of the East in the Second Century, (Propp. 301–303,) 315
SECTION FIFTH.—Witnesses of the East in the First Century, (Propp. 304, 305,) 317
SECTION SIXTH.—Testimonies of the West, (Propp. 306–311,) 318
SECTION SEVENTH.—Recapitulation of these Testimonies, (Prop. 312,) 321
SECTION EIGHTH.—The Pauline authorship of this Epistle, (Propp. 313–315,) 323
SECTION NINTH.—Objections, (Propp. 316–320,) . . 329

BOOK IV.

The Second Canon; or, The Five Antilegomena, . . . 335

CHAPTER I.

General Facts, (Propp. 321–324,) 335

CHAPTER II.

The Epistle of James, ... 338

SECTION FIRST.—Its Importance, (Propp. 325, 326,) . 338
SECTION SECOND.—Its Immediate Reception by that Portion of the Church to which it was first addressed, (Propp. 327, 328,) 340
SECTION THIRD.—Its Date, (Prop. 329,) . . . 341
SECTION FOURTH.—Causes of the Hesitation of some Churches, (Prop. 330,) 342
SECTION FIFTH.—Witnesses, (Propp. 331–335,) . . 343
SECTION SIXTH.—Its Excellence, (Prop. 336,) . . 346
SECTION SEVENTH.—Which James is its Author? (Propp. 337–340,) 346

CHAPTER III.

PAGE

The Second Epistle of Peter, ... 353

SECTION FIRST.—The study which it claims, (Prop. 341,) 353

SECTION SECOND.—The Epistle affirms that it was written by Peter, (Prop. 342,) 354

SECTION THIRD.—The majestic character of this Epistle strongly confirms this testimony, (Propp. 343, 344,) . 355

SECTION FOURTH.—The obstacles to its acceptance, (Prop. 345,) 358

SECTION FIFTH.—Its Style, (Prop. 346,) . . . 358

SECTION SIXTH.—Its History, (Prop. 347,) . . . 359

SECTION SEVENTH.—The definitive assent of all the Christian Churches was late, (Prop. 348,) . . . 361

SECTION EIGHTH.—The successive assent has been slow, (Propp. 349–353,) 362

SECTION NINTH.—The assent on the appearance of the Book was immediate among a part of the Churches, (Propp. 354–359,) 368

CHAPTER IV.

The Two Shorter Epistles of John, (Prop. 360–363), . . 372

CHAPTER V.

The Epistle of Jude, ... 375

SECTION FIRST.—(Prop. 364,) 375

SECTION SECOND.—The Author of the Epistle, (Propp. 365–367,) 375

SECTION THIRD.—Its Date, (Propp. 368, 369,) . . 376

SECTION FOURTH.—Objections against this Epistle, (Propp. 370–372,) 379

SECTION FIFTH.—Alleged citations of Apocryphal Books, (Propp. 373–380,) 380

SECTION SIXTH.—Testimonies of the Second Century, (Propp. 381–384,) 390

SECTION SEVENTH.—Testimonies of the Third Century, (Prop. 385,) 392

SECTION EIGHTH.—Testimonies of the Fourth Century, (Prop. 386,) 393

CHAPTER VI.

General considerations on the Antilegomena, (Propp. 387–400,) . 395

PART SECOND.

THE METHOD OF FAITH.

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY, (Propp. 401–403,) 411

BOOK I.

The Two Methods open for the Knowledge of the Canon, (Prop. 404,) 413

CHAPTER I.

Comparison of the Two Methods, (Propp. 405–409,) . . 414

CHAPTER II.

Objections to the Method of Science, (Prop. 410,) . . . 418

SECTION FIRST.—Its Novelty, (Prop. 411,) . . . 418
SECTION SECOND.—Its Inaccessibility, (Prop. 412,) . 419
SECTION THIRD.—Its Want of Spirituality, (Prop. 413,) . 419
SECTION FOURTH.—Its Dangers, (Propp. 414, 415,) . 419

CHAPTER III.

The advantages of the Method of Faith, (Propp. 416, 417,) . . 424

CHAPTER IV.

The true use of Science in relation to the Canon, (Propp. 418, 419,) 426

BOOK II.

PAGE
The Doctrine relating to the Canon, (Propp. 420, 421,) . . 429

CHAPTER I.

First Class of Proofs taken from the Wisdom and Faithfulness of God, (Prop. 422,) 431

SECTION FIRST.—Books of the Old Testament which are said to have been Lost, (Propp. 423–426,) . . 433
SECTION SECOND.—Books of the New Testament which are said to have been Lost, (Propp. 427–432,) . 435

CHAPTER II.

Second Class of Proofs founded on the Canon of the Old Testament, (Prop. 433,) 440

SECTION FIRST.—The astonishing and immovable Unanimity of the Jews on the subject of the Canon, (Propp. 434, 435,) 440
SECTION SECOND.—The Testimony of the Apostles to the Canon, (Prop. 436,) 443
SECTION THIRD.—The Testimony of Jesus Christ, (Prop. 437,) 444
SECTION FOURTH.—First Inference relative to the Old Testament, (Propp. 438–441,) 446
SECTION FIFTH.—The Second Inference, relating to the New Testament, (Propp. 442–449,) . . . 450

CHAPTER III.

Third Class of Proofs taken from the Declarations of Scripture, (Propp. 450–453,) 457

CHAPTER IV.

Fourth Class of Proofs—An assemblage of Facts relative to the Old Testament, attesting a Divine Intervention in its Preservation by the Jewish nation, ... 461
SECTION FIRST.—The constant and wonderful Fidelity of the Jews in reference to the Canon, from Moses to Jesus Christ, ... 461

PAGE

The First Fact, (Prop. 454,) . . . 461
The Second Fact, (Prop. 455,) . . . 462
The Third Fact, (Prop. 456,) . . . 462
The Fourth Fact, (Prop. 457,) . . . 462
SECTION SECOND.—The Fidelity, not less astonishing, of the Jews to their Canon since Jesus Christ to the Present Time, ... 463
The Fifth Fact, (Prop. 458,) . . . 463
The Sixth Fact, (Prop. 459,) . . . 463
SECTION THIRD.—The Text compared with the Versions, 464
The Seventh Fact, (Propp. 460–463,) . . 464
SECTION FOURTH.—The serious Divisions of the Jews, . 467
The Eighth Fact, (Prop. 464,) . . . 467
SECTION FIFTH.—The Example of Jesus and His Apostles in relation to the Apocrypha, ... 467
The Ninth Fact, (Propp. 465, 466,) . . 467
SECTION SIXTH.—Divine Injunctions, . . . 468
The Tenth Fact, (Prop. 467,) . . . 468
SECTION SEVENTH.—The Divine Dispensations, . . 469
The Eleventh Fact, (Propp. 468, 469,) . . 469
SECTION EIGHTH.—The Calamities of the Jews, . . 470
The Twelfth Fact, (Prop. 470,) . . . 470
SECTION NINTH.—The Miracle of their Race, . . 472
The Thirteenth Fact, (Prop. 471,) . . . 472
SECTION TENTH.—Human Books intruded into the Jewish Canon by one of the Christian sects, . . 473
The Fourteenth Fact, (Propp. 472–474,) . . 473
SECTION ELEVENTH.—The Testimony of the Eastern Church, ... 475
The Fifteenth and *Sixteenth Facts*, (Propp. 475–479,) 475
SECTION TWELFTH.—The Resistance of the Eastern Church is rendered more striking by the universality of the use of the Septuagint, ... 478
The Seventeenth Fact, (Prop. 480,) . . 478
SECTION THIRTEENTH.—Inference to be drawn from these Seventeen Facts, (Propp. 481–483,) . . . 479

CHAPTER V.

On the Apocrypha, ... 482

CHAPTER VI.

Fifth Class of Proofs—A new assemblage of Facts relating to the New Testament, (Prop. 520,) 483

PAGE

SECTION FIRST.—The Unanimity of all the Churches, . 483
The First Fact, (Propp. 521–526,) . . 483
SECTION SECOND.—The exceptional Liberty which always presided over the Destinies of the Canon, . 487
The Second Fact, (Propp. 527–530,) . . 487
SECTION THIRD.—The Progress of Minds in a way reverse of their natural direction, ... 491
The Third Fact, (Prop. 531,) . . . 491
SECTION FOURTH.—During the two centuries and a half in which the Ancient Church still hesitated respecting the Antilegomena, she never received a Spurious Book into the Canon, ... 492
The Fourth Fact, (Prop. 532,) . . . 492
SECTION FIFTH.—The astonishing Independence of the Church in reference to its Literary Opponents on the subject of the Canon, ... 493
The Fifth Fact, (Propp. 533–546,) . . 493

CHAPTER VII.

The attempts of the Church of Rome against the Scriptures, compared with her reserve towards the Canon of the New Testament, strongly attest the Divine Agency by a novel class of facts, ... 508
The Sixth Fact, (Propp. 547–549,) . . 508
SECTION FIRST.—Her Dogmas and Rites opposed to the Scriptures, (Prop. 550,) 510
SECTION SECOND.—The Infallibility of Rome opposed to that of the Scriptures, (Prop. 551,) . . . 512
SECTION THIRD.—The aversion of Rome to the Written Word, (Prop. 552,) 513
SECTION FOURTH.—The anxiety of Rome to keep the Bible at a distance from the People, and the People from it, (Propp. 553–558,) 514
SECTION FIFTH.—The long and cruel Severities of the Church of Rome inflicted on those who wish to read the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, (Propp. 559–562,) 518
SECTION SIXTH.—The Decrees of the Church of Rome reduce the Scriptures to a level with Tradition, (Propp. 563, 564,) 520
SECTION SEVENTH.—The Decrees of the Church of Rome place the Scriptures below the Roman Pontiff, (Prop. 565,) 521
SECTION EIGHTH.—The Power of all these Facts united to confirm the Doctrine of the Canon, (Propp. 566–568,) 522

CHAPTER VIII.

PAGE

The Seventh Class of Facts—the Pious Frauds in support of the Doctrines and Pretensions of the Roman Pontiffs, (Propp. 569–571,) 526

SECTION FIRST.—The False Decretals, (Propp. 572–576,) . 527
SECTION SECOND.—The Donation of Constantine, (Propp. 577, 578,) 531
SECTION THIRD.—False Books of the Fathers fabricated or quoted, (Propp. 579–581,) 533
SECTION FOURTH.—The Breviary, (Propp. 582–584,) . 536
SECTION FIFTH.—The Genuine Works of the Fathers falsified, (Propp. 585–592,) 538
SECTION SIXTH.—The Index Expurgatorius, (Propp. 593–597,) 542
SECTION SEVENTH.—Conclusion of this Chapter, (Propp. 598, 599,) 546

CHAPTER IX.

The Decisive Adoption of the Second Canon contrary to the Natural Inclination of Men's Minds, ... 548
Eighth Fact, (Propp. 600–610,) . . . 548

CHAPTER X.

The Wonderful Preservation of the Original Text, . . . 555
Ninth Fact, (Propp. 611–615,) . . . 555

CHAPTER XI.

The Striking Contrast between the Errors of Rome regarding the Old Testament, and its Fidelity regarding the New, . . 560
Tenth Fact, (Propp. 616–621,) . . . 560

CHAPTER XII.

The Destinies of the Epistle to the Hebrews, . . . 566
Eleventh Fact, (Propp. 622–625,) . . 566

SECTION FIRST.—The variations of Rome three times in three hundred years, (Propp. 622, 623,) . . 566

PAGE

SECTION SECOND.—The firmness of Rome since the fixation of the Canon, (Propp. 624, 625,) . . 567

SECTION THIRD.—Two considerations which render this Proof more striking, (Propp. 626–630,) . . 569

CHAPTER XIII.

The great Manifestations of that Providence which preserves the Oracles of God, rendering it visible on three occasions in the stormy times of Diocletian, of Charles V., and of Napoleon I., (Prop. 631,) 573

SECTION FIRST.—The Wonderful Preservation of the Scriptures after the Persecutions of the Fourth Century, 573

Twelfth Fact, (Propp. 632–637,) . . . 573

SECTION SECOND.—The Restoration of the Bible by means of the Reformation at the beginning of the Sixteenth Century, (Propp. 638–657,) 580

SECTION THIRD.—The Bible Society, at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, circulating the Scriptures throughout the World, (Propp. 658–676,) . . 608

CHAPTER XIV.

Final Inferences, (Propp. 677–682,) 622

APPENDIX ON THE APOCRYPHA.

SECTION FIRST.—History of the Apocrypha to the time of the Council of Trent, (Propp. 484–488,) 629

SECTION SECOND.—Unanimity of the Testimony of the Church against the Decree of the Council of Trent, (Propp. 489–492,) 635

SECTION THIRD.—The Allegations of the Defenders of the Decree, (Propp. 493–519,) 646

CANONICITY

OF

THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE.

THE object of this work is to demonstrate, from the Word of God and from history, the exclusive right of the *thirty-nine* books of the Old Testament, and of the *twenty-seven* books of the New, to a place in the list of inspired writings.

This right is called their *canonicity*.

We shall first establish it from history, as regards the New Testament; and then establish it by doctrinal evidence, as regards the whole Bible.

---

1. The Christian Church, as Paul declares, is "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets," who preached the gospel to it,—Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, on which the whole building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord; and on which all true believers also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.

2. It is, therefore, on the foundation of Jesus Christ, and of those whom He appointed "apostles and prophets," that the Church finds from age to age, as from day to day, in the constant use of the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, her life, her growth, her power, and her beauty.

3. In a previous work we have, we trust, adequately proved the

divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. It is to their integrity, their authenticity, their divine origin, that our attention is now directed.

4. Since, however, as the reader will soon perceive, the evidence which establishes the canon of the New Testament establishes, at the same time, that of the Old, we shall, in Part First, confine our inquiry to the former, and reserve for Part Second our examination of the latter, in reviewing the providential events with which it is connected, &c.

5. The Church has two modes of verifying the canon,—that of science, which appeals to history or sacred criticism, and that of faith, which appeals to a doctrine or principle ("*à une dogme.*") This treatise we shall divide into two parts. The first, dedicated to the scientific method, will chiefly aim at establishing the authenticity of the New Testament. The second, extending to Moses and the Prophets as much as to the New Testament, and following the line of faith, will seek to illustrate what we call the Doctrine of the Canon.

PART FIRST.

CANONICITY OF ALL THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

DEFINITIONS OF THE CANON.

6. THE use of the term *canon*,[1] in the acceptation it still retains, may be traced to a very high antiquity. In Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the words קָנֶה, *Κάννη*, *Κάννα*, *Κάνων*, *canna*, all derived from the same source, literally mean a *reed*, a *straight rod*, a *cane*, *a measure*, a *rule*; and *Κάνων*, in a figurative sense, more particularly denotes a very *accurate and perfect rule*. It was in the strict and literal sense that the words *rod* and *canon* were applied in the Middle Ages to tubes used in throwing projectiles by means of gunpowder; and it was figuratively that Paul said to the Galatians, "As many as walk by *this rule* (this canon), peace be on them;" [2] and to the Philippians, "Whereto we have attained, let us walk by the same rule." [3]

7. So early as in the times of Paul, the grammarians of Alexandria used the same term to denote the whole assemblage of such approved works as were deemed standards of excellence in literature; and ecclesiastical writers soon adopted it to express sometimes the whole compass of *Christian doctrine*—our rule of life; sometimes the *Sacred Volume*—our only rule of faith; and sometimes the list of Scriptures, of which that rule consists.

The last acceptation finally predominated, and in this sense, accordingly, it will be employed in the present work.

[1] It was in Italy and in Italian (*cannone* or *grande canna*) that the term was used to denote an instrument of war.

[2] Gal. vi. 16. [3] Phil. iii. 16.

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEA OF A NEW TESTAMENT CANON AS EARLY AS THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES.

THE idea of a New Testament canon must have existed at a very early period of the Christian Church. This may be inferred from the nature of the case, independently of direct evidence on the subject. This idea must have had its origin from the moment when the "apostles and prophets," who had "preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," began to transmit to their converts apostolic epistles or narratives of the Saviour's life and discourses.

In fact, their knowledge of the Old Testament had fully prepared Christian congregations for the reception of such documents. That sacred volume, whose canon had been formed for centuries, and about whose divine authority the Jews, as Josephus informs us, were entirely agreed, had at all periods been revered by the people of God. It was revered by the apostles, who called it as a whole "*the oracles of God.*" It was revered by the Son of God himself, who called it "*the Law, your Law, the Scripture, the Scriptures.*" It was revered by the Christian converts, who read it solemnly in their assemblies. Thus naturally arose in the minds of Christians the notion of a collection of New Testament writings corresponding to the collection of the books forming the Old Testament.

8. The notion of a canon of Scripture had been, for fifteen hundred years, the great characteristic of the Hebrew nation, and was regarded by them as inseparable from their existence as God's chosen people. This notion, which the Israelitish church received in the wilderness, and ever afterwards preserved, was not that of a

completed system of legislation, promulgated once for all, and never to receive any additions. On the contrary, it was that of a collection of documents, commencing with the five books of Moses, and gradually enlarging from age to age by fresh communications from heaven, during eleven hundred years, as God, from time to time, raised up successive prophets, and closing only with Malachi, when the spirit of prophecy became silent for four centuries. It was, therefore, quite natural that, at the advent of the Messiah, the Church should look for fresh communications; as the spirit of prophecy had just been restored to it, men of God, "apostles and prophets," had been raised up, even more marvellous than the prophets of old. We will even maintain that it was impossible such an expectation should not exist. The period of Christ's advent was far more important and more solemn than that of its announcement. Its revelations were more striking, its objects more divine, its promises more rich, its prophets more powerful, its signs and wonders more marvellous.

9. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the Church had its origin in the Synagogue, and that, during the first fifteen years of its existence, all its members were Israelites. All its preachers, as well as all its early converts, were Jews. At the period of Paul's last visit to the Christians of Jerusalem, the members of the Church there, the mother of all the other Churches of Christ, already amounted to myriads, (Acts xxi. 20, πόσαι μυριάδες.) In all the cities of the Gentiles the apostles began their labours with the children of Israel. In addressing them, they constantly held in their hands the canon of Scripture; incessantly urging them, as Christ had done, to search the Scriptures, as testifying of Christ, (John v. 39.) On all occasions they "expounded to them and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening," (Acts xxviii. 23;) "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," (Acts xxvi. 22.) Though, when addressing heathen audiences, they did not directly quote the sacred writings, they earnestly directed to them the attention of believing Gentiles from the moment of their conversion. "Now to Him," said Paul, in concluding his Epistle to the Romans, "to Him that is of power to

stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, (according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, *by the scriptures of the prophets*, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of the faith;) to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen."

Thus, on the one hand, the idea of a canon of Scripture was, as it were, innate in the minds of the people of God, and inseparable from their conception of a church; while, on the other, the idea of adding to the sacred books of the Old Testament the no less sacred books of the New, as successively put forth, was equally inseparable from their notion of Scripture.

10. The early existence of this idea of a Scripture canon is distinctly attested by the history of early Christianity. Far from being a subsequent conception, it appears conspicuously under every varied form, from the very commencement of the Christian Church, both among the enemies and the champions of the gospel.

We shall examine this point more in detail by and by. In the meantime, we confine ourselves to a few quotations.

Peter, towards the end of his career, refers, in his second epistle, to "all the epistles" of Paul, as already collected, and calls them "*Scriptures;*" putting them on a level with the books of the Old Testament, which he calls "*the other Scriptures.*"[1]

The primitive Christians successively collected the apostolic writings from the moment of their appearance; received them as of the same authority with the Old Testament, read them in their assemblies, and called them, as Peter did, *the Scriptures*, or, as the Fathers did, *the Book*, *τὰ Βιβλία*; *the New Testament*;[2] *the*

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 16. This testimony, independently of the objections of some persons to the canonicity of this epistle, incontestably proves the antiquity of the usage that regarded the books of the New Testament as part of the Scriptures; for we shall demonstrate the *antiquity* of this epistle, independently of its *canonicity*.

[2] See Lardner, vol. viii., page 197. See also vol. ii., page 529. As Paul had given the name of "Old Testament" to the *writings* of Moses and the Prophets, it was quite natural that the *writings* of the Evangelists and Apostles should receive the name of "*New Testament*," and that the books admitted into the Canon should be styled *Testamental* or *ἐνδιάθηκαι*, (Eusebius, H. E. vi., 25.)

Divine Document;[1] *the Sacred Digest*;[2] *the Oracles of God*; or *the Gospel and the Apostle, the Gospels and the Apostles*;[3] after the example of Jesus Christ, who had called the Old Testament "*the Law and the Prophets.*" It thus appears at how early a period the Christian Church began to speak of the *Canon* or *Rule*, and to give the name of "*canonical books*" to such as formed a part of that infallible code.

Irenæus, born in Greece in the year 120, and martyred in the year 202,[4] speaking of the Scriptures as divine, calls them *the Rule*, or *the Canon*, of truth—*κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας*.[5]

Tertullian, in the same century, contrasting *Valentine* with *Marcion*, both deeply immersed in the Gnostic heresy, says of the former, about the year 138, that he, at least, appeared to make use of a *complete document*, meaning a complete and entire collection of the books of the New Testament, as then received in the Church.[6]

Clement of Alexandria, in the same century, speaking of a quotation taken from an apocryphal book, exclaims against those who thought proper to follow any authority besides "the true evangelical canon;" and Origen, born seventeen years before the end of the same century, zealous, as Eusebius[7] says, in maintaining the *ecclesiastical canon*, *τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα*, "declares that he only recognised the four Gospels; which alone," he adds, "are received without controversy in the universal Church spread over the whole earth."[8] The same Origen, in giving us a list of the canonical Scriptures, calls them the *Testamental* Scriptures (*αἱ ἐνδιάθηκαι γραφαί*), that is, "the Scriptures contained in the New Testament."

Athanasius, in his Festal epistle,[9] speaks of three sorts of books:

[1] *Tertullian* adv. Marcion, lib. v., cap. 13. [2] Ibid., lib. iv., cap. 13.

[3] *Clement of Alexandria*, Strom. vii., pages 706, 757. *Ignatius*, Ep. to the Philad., ch. 5; Ep. to Diognetus, ch. 11. *Justin Martyr*, First Apol., ch. 67; *Tertullian*, De Græc. Scrip., cap. 36; Apol., cap. 39. *Hippolytus the Martyr*, On Antichrist, ch. 58.

[4] Or, according to others, in the year 140.

[5] *Adv.* Hæreses, lib. iii., cap. 11; lib. iv., cap. 35 and 69.

[6] *Tertullian*, De Præscript. Hæretic, cap. 30, 38.

[7] Ecc. Hist., vi., ch. 25. [8] Ibid.

[9] Chap. xxxix., vol. ii., p. 961, edit. Benedict, *τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τὲ θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία.*

the *canonical*, (which are those recognised by the Church at the present day;) the *ecclesiastical*, (which were allowed to be read in Christian assemblies;) and the *apocryphal*.

When, subsequently, the Council of Laodicea (in 364) ordained that no other book should be read in the churches but the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, it was so far from then introducing for the first time the notion of canonical books, as distinguished from uncanonical, that it merely referred to principles long established in the universal Church.

Jerome, also, frequently speaks of the Canon of Scripture: "Ecclesiasticus," says he, "Judith, Tobit, The Shepherd, . . . are not in the Canon. The Church permits the reading of Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees; but it does not receive them into the list of *Canonical* Scriptures. The books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus may be read for edification by the people, but not as authority for establishing points of doctrine."[1]

Such is the origin of the idea of a Canon of Scripture, and such is its import.

[1] See also Lardner, vol. x., pp. 41, 43, 52.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH, FROM THE COMMENCEMENT, REGARDED THE COLLECTION OF SCRIPTURES AS A HARMONIC WHOLE.

11. THE primitive Church received the books of the New Testament one after another; but regarded the collection, in its gradual formation, as one distinct whole, having God for its author, and the manifestation of Jesus Christ as its sole purpose, in the same way that the ancient Israel of God regarded the code of the Old Testament, in its gradual formation, as one harmonic whole, having God for its author, and His plan of redeeming His elect as its sole object.

12. We shall give merely one or two illustrations of this at present, taken from the records of the first century, or of the beginning of the second. The author of the beautiful *Epistle to Diognetus*, a disciple, as he states, of the apostles, represents *the Law and the Prophets, the Gospel and the Apostles*, as acting in concert to bring grace and joy into the Church. "Thus," says he, "the terror of the *Law* is proclaimed, the grace of the *Prophets* made known, the faith of the *Gospels* established, and the teaching of the *Apostles* maintained, and the grace of the Church leaps with joy."[1]

Ignatius likewise, about the year 107, in one of his epistles, said to the Philadelphians (ch. v.): "Your prayers will obtain for me to be perfected in God, fleeing for refuge to the *Gospel*, as the flesh of Jesus, and to the apostles, as the Presbytery of the Church. We adhere also to the prophets, who themselves pro-

[1] Chap. xi. Εἶτα φόβος νόμου ᾄδεται, καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γινώσκεται, καὶ εὐαγγελίων πίστις ἱδρύεται, καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις φυλάσσεται, καὶ ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ.

claimed the Gospel, hoped in Christ, waited for His coming in the unity of Jesus Christ, and found salvation through faith in Him." [1]

13. As the Canon of the New Testament is a collection of books written at different times and in different places during the last half of the apostolic century, by eight inspired authors, it could only be completed gradually, and could only assume its entireness towards the end of the first century, or at the beginning of the century following.

[1] Προσφυγὼν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις ὡ πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας. Καὶ τοὺς Προφήτας, &c. This epistle, however, i one of those which Mr Cureton has left out in his Syriac edition. See propos tion 250.

CHAPTER IV.

FIRST FORMATION OF THE CANON.

14. DURING the first fifteen years after the death of our Lord the Church was brought into existence, grew and was nourished by the oral preaching of the truth, and by the scriptures of the Old Testament, explained either by themselves or by the teaching of the apostles and evangelists,—"God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will," (Heb. ii. 4; 2 Pet. i. 21.)

15. The apostles and evangelists, while preaching the Word to the Churches, "by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," constantly appealed, as their Master had done, to the already closed canon of the Old Testament. They required their disciples to study it incessantly; and declared it "able to make the man of God perfect, wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Jesus Christ, and thoroughly furnished unto all good works," (2 Tim. iii. 15–17.)

16. It was not till fifteen years after the ascension of our Saviour that the old canon of the "oracles of God," which had been closed for four hundred years, was re-opened to receive the earliest writing of the New Testament. I mean the epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians; for there is every reason to believe that the Gospel of Mark, and even that of Matthew, did not precede these; and that the Gospels of Luke and John followed them after a very long interval. Thus, for two or three years, the sacred canon of the New Testament consisted merely of these two epistles, which Paul, aided by Silas and Timotheus, had written, about the year 48, to the infant church of Thessalonica.

17. It is, therefore, very probably owing to the circumstance

that these two epistles were to commence the new collection of "oracles of God," that the apostle from the first took such pains to intimate to the Church their divine authority. He "charges them by the Lord," to keep them, to study them, and to spread copies of them. He solemnly enjoins them, by invoking God's awful name, to cause this earliest portion of Scripture to be made known and read in all the churches of Christ. "I charge you," says he, in conclusion, (ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Κύριον,) "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren," (1 Thess. v. 27.) This portion of Scripture he addressed to a church that his Gospel had reached, "not in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost," (1 Thess. i. 5;) and he carefully reminds them that the word he had brought to them was *that of God;* and thanks God that they had received it, "*not as the word of man, but, as it is in reality, the word of God.*"

18. It was during the sixteen or seventeen years that elapsed from the appearance of these first two books of the New Testament (in 48), and the death of Paul (in 64 or 65), that nearly all the other scriptures of the New Testament were written; at least the *twenty books* we shall by and by have occasion to mention as the *first canon;* that is, the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the first thirteeen epistles of Paul, the First Epistle of Peter, and the First of John.

19. It was at a later period, that is, towards the end of the first century, that the other seven books of the New Testament were put forth, with the exception of the Epistle of James, which must have been written about the year 61; as, according to the historian Josephus, James was stoned to death during the troubles that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, immediately after the death of the governor Festus, and while the arrival of Albinus in Judea was still looked for.[1]

20. Thus the whole canon of the scriptures of the New Testament was commenced and completed during the latter half of the first century. It was during this period that the Church, already formed and unceasingly extending, reached the extremities of the earth, through the incomparable labours of Paul, Peter, John,

[1] Antiq., xx., c. 8.

Thomas, and other apostles, as well as of so many other witnesses, whose names, unknown to us, are recorded in heaven.

21. It is, therefore, necessary we should distinctly understand that the primitive Church, during her militant and triumphant march through the first half-century of her existence, saw her New Testament canon forming in her hand, as a nosegay is gradually formed in the hand of a lady walking through plots of flowers with the proprietor of the garden by her side. As she advances, the latter presents to her flower after flower, till she finds herself in possession of an entire bunch. And, just as the nosegay attracts admiring attention before it is filled up, and as soon as the few first flowers have been put together, so the New Testament canon began to exist for the Christian Church from the moment the earliest portions of inspired Scriptures had been put into her hands.

In the same manner, under the Old Testament in the time of David, a thousand years before the apostles, the Church of Israel already possessed a sacred canon, consisting of seven or eight books, and called it her *Law*, her divine and perfect Law, though two-thirds of the Old Testament were still wanting. "The Law," she already exclaimed, "is a light to my feet; it refreshes my soul; I talk of it the whole day long." In the same way, also, five hundred years before David, and in the time of Moses, the Church of Israel possessed her sacred canon, and expressed herself thus:— "Happy art thou, O Israel! who is like unto thee, O people, saved of the Lord! for this Law is not a vain thing for us, it is our life," (Deut. xxxiii. 29, xxxii. 47.)

22. The Church, at each successive period, was responsible for the books God had already given her, and not for those He might afterwards give. At all times she received from Him those she required; and at all times she had reason to say, with David, "The law of the Lord is perfect."

23. It will easily be perceived how important it is, for the confirming of our faith, that the New Testament, instead of having been communicated all at once by the Founder of our religion Himself personally recording His acts and His revelations, should have emanated from Him successively during the space of half-a-century, in a series of twenty-seven writings, the productions of

eight different individuals, separated from each other by great distances of place, and distinguished from each other by circumstances the most dissimilar; some of them learned, others unlettered; some in Judea, others in Rome; some writing only ten or fifteen years after the death of their Master, others fifty years after that event; some of them having been personally strangers to Him, one of them even His most bitter persecutor; while some of them had been among His most devoted and assiduous friends. The result of all this diversity is, that the harmony with which all, notwithstanding, reveal to us His life, His character, His origin, and His doctrines,—the unchanging agreement they maintain on subjects the most transcendent, as well as in expounding duties the most completely misunderstood; in a word, that marvellous and deep unity in their teaching stands forth both more striking and more majestic than it otherwise could have done.

No wonder, then, that the Sacred Volume—fitted to charm every people, even the most savage,—responding everywhere to the wants of man, and adapting itself through every age to every stage of civilisation—should everywhere elevate the human character, and produce, under all circumstances, effects that no other teaching could ever achieve; changing the affections, subduing the will, giving birth to heroism in every form, and civilising in the space of a few years nations the rudest: as, in the earliest periods of its existence, it shewed itself able to overthrow, in the most refined regions of the world, idolatries whose origin was lost in the night of antiquity, renewing in its wonderful progress the face of the world.

CHAPTER V.

ORAL PREACHING WAS, OF NECESSITY, BY SOME YEARS ANTERIOR TO WRITTEN PREACHING, OR THE GIFT OF NEW SCRIPTURES.

24. It was fitting that the apostles should, for some years, preach by word of mouth, before commencing the New Testament canon; as it was necessary that,—before adding new inspired writings to the Sacred Volume, the continuation of which had been interrupted for four centuries,—they should be able to intrust their deposit to living churches spread over the whole civilised world. It was, accordingly, indispensable that an intelligent and believing people of God should first be gathered, either from the Gentiles or from the Jews. This was essential, especially for two reasons:—First, that it might distinctly appear that the religion of Jesus Christ, far from being at variance with Moses and the prophets, was, on the contrary, founded on what their inspired writings had revealed; and, secondly, that when the divine epistles which were to form the commencement of the New Testament canon appeared, there might be a people prepared to receive, preserve, and transmit them. It was requisite there should be pious and truly converted men, formed into churches, to whom narratives and letters should be addressed, and who should successively receive these new scriptures, and attest their authenticity, either by reading them in their solemn assemblies every Sabbath or every Lord's day, (and Justin Martyr testifies that this was actually done;[1]) or by preserving their original texts in their houses of prayer, (as, according to the testimony of Tertullian, they did.) Thus was the written word faithfully transmitted, from age to age, to all the churches of God.

[1] First Apology, 67.

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORICAL DIVISION OF THE CANON INTO THREE DISTINCT PARTS.

25. We shall apply the name of *First Canon* (or *First Rule*) to the list of twenty books enumerated above, (prop. 18,) as these were circulated before the others, during the lives of the apostles, and under their immediate care, and at once received by the whole Christian community, both of the East and of the West; nor, during the space of eighteen centuries, has either their authenticity or their Divine authority ever been called in question by the churches of Christ.

26. This *First Canon*, consisting of books never controverted, forms, by itself, *eight-ninths of the New Testament*, if we reckon by the number of verses; for out of 7959, they contain 7059.

27. We shall give the name of *Second Canon* (or *Second Rule*) to the five small and late epistles of James, Peter, Jude, and John, collectively. These books were written shortly before the death of these men of God, and circulated after their decease, at a period of trouble, when their writers were no longer present to attest them. Not being addressed, like the first thirteen epistles of Paul, to individuals or particular churches directed to guard them and make them known, these five brief epistles were at first received only by most, and not by all, ecclesiastical writers and Christian churches, (τοῖς πολλοῖς, τοῖς πλείστοις, says Eusebius.) Some churches hesitating, for a longer or shorter space of time, to acknowledge their Divine authority, they were at length universally received, from the date of the first universal council of the churches of Christ.

28. The second canon, computed by the number of verses, only

amounts to the *thirty-sixth part of the New Testament;* for, out of 7959 verses, it contains only 222.

29. We shall, lastly, give the name of *Second-first Canon* to two books collectively—the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse —as these cannot be placed unrestrictedly either in the first canon or in the second. They cannot be placed in the *second,* because, from the moment of their appearance, and during the first two centuries of the Church, they were received universally and without opposition. Eusebius, for this reason, classes them with the *uncontroverted,* (or ὁμολογούμενα.) Neither can they be placed unrestrictedly in the *first* canon, as, after being generally received, they were subsequently controverted by certain churches for some time; the one book chiefly in the West, and the other chiefly in the East.

We shall, by and by, touch on these facts more in detail.

CHAPTER VII.

THIS THREEFOLD DIVISION OF THE CANON IS, MOREOVER, WARRANTED BY THE MOST AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

30. In thus dividing the canon of the New Testament into three distinct parts, we would by no means be understood as considering the Divine authority of some of its books more certain than that of the others. We shall, by and by, prove that, though under a purely historical point of view, the evidence in favour of all of them is not the same; our belief in the Divine authority of them all is established in one and the same manner, and on the surest grounds. We readily, however, adopt this threefold division, both in conformity with the facts of ecclesiastical history, and for the purpose of proceeding more methodically in the historical demonstration of the canonicity of the New Testament scriptures.

Section First.

THREE ANTE-NICENE CATALOGUES.

31. To warrant this threefold distinction, ecclesiastical literature supplies, in addition to numerous testimonies of the fathers, three ancient catalogues of the Scriptures, not indeed all identical, but all serving to establish the distinction in question. All three are anterior to the famous Council of Nice. The first of these goes back to about the period of the death of John; that is, to the end of the first, or beginning of the second century; the second, to the beginning of the third century; and the last, to the beginning of the fourth. The first is derived from the ancient Syriac version of the New Testament, called the *Peshito*.[1] The second is furnished by Origen, and that twice; once directly, in a

[1] That is, the *Simple*,—that which gives the natural or literal sense.

Homily on Joshua;[1] and again indirectly, in the quotations which Eusebius makes from Origen's commentaries on Matthew, John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews.[2] The third is given by Eusebius himself, in 324, in the third book of "Ecclesiastical History."

These, then, are the only trustworthy catalogues, anterior to the Council of Nice, that have reached us. We do not here reckon either the catalogue contained in the apocryphal productions called the *Apostolic Canons*, nor the anonymous Roman catalogue, for which we are indebted to the discoveries made, in 1738, by Muratori in the Ambrosian library at Milan, and usually called the *Muratori* document.[3] It is a deeply-mutilated fragment; the date and the author of which are entirely unknown. Defective at the beginning, defective again towards the end, it exists only in the form of a Latin translation, singularly barbarous and strangely inaccurate. *Librariorum imperitia, ... incuria atque ignorantia, ... scripturam saturavit atque fœdavit*, says *Muratori* himself. In a word, the document (which, moreover, gives us nearly the same canon as the *Peshito*) is too imperfect to enable us to determine doubtful points connected with the history of the canon; but as it may otherwise be of great use towards establishing the authenticity of our Scriptures, we shall again direct special attention to it in Book II.[4]

Section Second.

PESHITO CATALOGUE.[5]

32. The *Peshito* is of all versions of the New Testament the most ancient, the most celebrated, and the most valued. It has been known in Europe only since the year 1552, on the occasion of Moses of Mardin being sent on a deputation from the Patriarch of the Maronites to Pope Julius III. Michaelis, who, with many other eminent scholars, considers it of the first century,

[1] Hom. 8. Opp. xii., p. 410: Latin translation by Ruffinus.

[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., vi., c. 25.

[3] Muratori, Antiq. Italicæ, vol. iii., p. 854. [4] See Propp. 193-198.

[5] On this version may be consulted,—1. Adler, N. T. Vers. Syriacæ, Copenh. 1789. 2. Hug, Introduct., p. 62. 3. Dr Wiseman, Horæ Syriacæ, Rome, 1828. 4. Wickelhaus, De N. T. Vers. Syriaca Peschito, Halle, 1850. 5. W. Cureton, Remains of a very ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, London, 1858.

or, at the latest, of the second, pronounces it the best of all known versions in regard to ease of expression, elegance, and fidelity. All who have studied it admire the good sense, the erudition, the independence, and the accuracy of the translators. As to its antiquity, every body will admit that the Aramæan-speaking Christians must have early furnished themselves with the Scriptures in their own language. They were, in fact, the first to receive the gospel: their churches were very numerous, not only in Syria, but on the banks of the Euphrates and of the Tigris, in the Adiabene and the Osroene territories, at Edessa, Nisibe, and Carrhæ; and their literature was then in a high state of advancement.

The scriptures of the New Testament must then have been very early translated by them into the language spoken by the primitive Church, the language spoken also by Jesus Christ himself. We accordingly find, in the history of Eusebius, traces of its being already usual in those parts to read and quote the Syriac scriptures of the New Testament. In speaking of the famous Hegesippus, the most ancient ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius, to prove to us that Hegesippus was undoubtedly an Israelitish Christian, remarks, that he took his quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and from the Syriac Gospel, (*ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ.*) This Hegesippus, whose writings are lost, but who had narrated in five books the history of the Church, under the title of "A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles," was, Eusebius tells us, nearly a contemporary of the Apostles, (*ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν Ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς*)—"for he lived," says he, "under Hadrian, (from 117 to 138,) and also under Anicetus, (from 157 to 168.)" Accordingly, Jerome, in his "List of Ecclesiastical Writers," places him before Justin Martyr, who was born in 103, and died in 167. These facts prove the high antiquity of the Peshito version.

Various other circumstances furnish additional evidence on the same point. The Syrian Christians, from the earliest period to the present time, have, with one accord, gone so far as to maintain that the Peshito was the original of the New Testament. They found their assertion on the alleged fact, that their language was that of the apostles and the earliest Christians in Jerusalem, where congregations, on being formed, were distinguished into

Hellenic and *Hebrew*, (or Aramæan;) and that also of the churches founded among the Eastern Jews, especially in Babylonia and the Osroene territory, where a Syriac Old Testament had existed for centuries. All the fathers, as is well known, maintain that Matthew's Gospel was first published in Aramæan; though it is more probable that Matthew put forth, at the same time, a two-fold original of his Gospel, the one in Greek, and the other in Aramæan. At least it is certain, that from the age of the apostles, wherever any one of the three Aramæan dialects was spoken, Aramæan versions of the various books of the New Testament were in circulation.

Edessa, where Aramæan literature had long been cultivated with great ardour, and where the apostle Thaddæus (as Eusebius informs[1] us) preached the Christian faith with so splendid success, is frequently mentioned as the place that gave birth to the Peshito. It had become, so early as the second century, the seat of an important Christian school; it was called "the holy city," on account of its unswerving zeal for the Christian faith; and even Eusebius states, "that from the success of Thaddæus, till the time at which he wrote, (324—εἰς ἔτι τὸ νῦν ἐξ ἐκείνου,) the inhabitants of Edessa (ἡ πᾶσα τῶν Ἐδεσσηνῶν πόλις) had continued to shew their attachment to the name of Christ."

What further serves to establish the venerable antiquity of this version is the fact of its being unanimously used by the various sects into which the Syrian Christians are divided—Nestorians, Jacobites, Romanists, all employ it in their respective services. Although, according to Wiseman, there are as many as twelve Syriac versions of the Old Testament, and three of the New, none of these has ever supplanted the Peshito in the services of the Church. It must, therefore, have been adopted universally before the appearance of these various sects.

33. This version contains the whole of our canon, with the exception merely of the Apocalypse and the four small and later epistles of Jude, Peter, and John.

Such, then, was the canon of the Syrian churches at the beginning of the second century, or, rather, at the end of the first. "The Peshito," says Adler, "is found, at the present day, under

[1] Hist. Eccl., ii., p. 1.

two forms of manuscripts; some in ancient Syriac characters, and others (of Indian origin) in Nestorian characters. All these manuscripts now exhibit the same canon."

34. Two circumstances connected with these manuscripts are very important:—

(1.) The absence of every non-canonical book, though in the East, from the commencement of the second century, many such began to be published under false apostolic titles.

(2.) The arrangement of the sacred books is in all of them the same as that of the best and most ancient Greek manuscripts. First we have the four Gospels, according to their invariable order, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; then the Acts of the Apostles; then the Catholic epistles; and, lastly, the fourteen epistles of Paul, in the usual order, Romans, Corinthians (1, 2), Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians (1, 2), Timotheus (1, 2), Titus, Philemon, Hebrews.[1]

35. We can easily understand why the two small epistles of John, written at so late a date, and at so great a distance from Babylonia, should not be comprehended in the Peshito. In regard to the Apocalypse, it could not, as we shall afterwards see, form a part of it, as it was published at Ephesus, on the shores of the Ægean, about the end of the first century, or beginning of the second, that is, after the Peshito, or, at least, very shortly before that version was published in the East. John did not see his visions in Patmos till about the end of the reign of Domitian, as Irenæus so distinctly informs us; so that, at the earliest reckoning, the publication of the Apocalypse could only have taken place during the last four years of the first century, or the commencement of the second. What proves very clearly that the absence of the Apocalypse in the Peshito is owing solely to the earlier publication of the latter, is the fact that the Syrian churches, far from rejecting it, when it afterwards reached them, quoted it as a book of Divine authority. Dr Thiersch, who considers the Peshito pos-

[1] This connects it with the Greek Testament. In the Latin versions anterior to Jerome, who brought back to the original Greek standard the Western texts, the order of the four Gospels had been transposed, as may still be seen in the Codex Bezæ at Cambridge. In his preface to Pope Damasus, Jerome shews to what extent in his time the alterations had been carried in the Latin copies of the Gospels. See Berger de Xivrey, "Etudes sur le Texte du N. T.," Paris, 1856.

terior in date to the publication of the Apocalypse, is convinced that version originally contained this sacred book. "We cannot," says he, "have any doubt on this point, after the researches of Hug. Otherwise, how could Ephrem have had a Syriac Apocalypse? It must, further, be remarked, that if the Peshito did not contain the Apocalypse, it contained the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle of James; as these two epistles, though late and almost posthumous, must have been both published before the martyrdom of Paul; and would, naturally, be more quickly received by the Syrian churches, to which they were directly communicated, than by the churches of the Gentiles.

36. From these facts it follows, that this most ancient of all existing catalogues of the New Testament scriptures,—this document which so nearly reaches the days of the apostles, that it seems contemporaneous with the last years of John,—warrants our dividing the canon of New Testament scriptures into two or into three parts; the first containing the twenty books always and everywhere received by every section of the Christian Church; the second, two books never controverted by the Aramæan-speaking Christians in Palestine, Syria, the Adiabene, Mesopotamia, the Osroene; the third, five other books, whose title to rank in the list of the oracles of God was not yet admitted by the Aramæan churches during the early part of the second century.

Section Third.

ORIGEN'S CATALOGUE.

37. Passing from the commencement of the second century to the commencement of the third, we come to a period in the Church's history rendered illustrious by the great teachers then raised up almost simultaneously, in provinces of the empire the most remote from each other: *Tertullian* in Africa; *Irenæus* in Gaul; *Hippolytus* in Arabia and at Rome; *Clement*, who closed his career in Egypt when *Origen* was there beginning his; and soon afterwards, *Gregory* in the kingdom of Pontus, and *Cyprian* at Carthage. This remarkable period supplies us with a second catalogue, and that from the hands of the great Origen.

Before examining its contents, it is important to point out the high value of Origen's testimony in reference to the canon of Scrip-

ture, derived from the character, piety, erudition, and prodigious labours of that extraordinary man.

38. Origen, in spite of certain doctrinal errors into which his piety was drawn by his genius, was one of the greatest luminaries of Christian antiquity, from his marvellous erudition, his skill in the sacred languages, his veneration for the Scriptures, his indefatigable ardour in Biblical researches, his perspicuity in expounding Holy Writ, as well as from the uniform purity of his life, his faithfulness in confessing Jesus Christ, and his holy firmness amid persecution. Though his doctrinal views on some points are of inferior value, his historical and literary testimony is of the greatest weight on the present question. His labours, in fact, were Herculean. No teacher ever made equal exertions for the collation, exposition, and circulation of the Holy Scriptures. Born in 185, he was martyred at the age of sixty-eight, in 253. He was distinguished for his attainments when hardly eighteen years old. Becoming an instructor of the catechumens at Alexandria, he was soon afterwards, in spite of his youth, appointed successor to his master, the famous Clement of Alexandria, in the catechetical chair of that city. Such was the renown he speedily acquired by his lectures, that the most illustrious of the heathens flocked to hear him; and the emperor Alexander, pagan as he was, and his mother Mammæa, being in Syria, and eager to have the privilege of hearing him, sent a military escort to conduct him from Antioch to Alexandria. At the age of eighteen he had visited Rome; and after his return to Alexandria commenced his vast labours on the Scriptures. He was, however, obliged to leave Egypt in the year 233, and take refuge, first at Cæsarea in Palestine, and subsequently at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. "So intense," says Eusebius, "was his unremitting ardour in Biblical researches, (*τοσαύτη τῶν θείων λόγων ἀπηκριβωμένη ἐξέτασις,*) that he was at pains to procure the most authentic (*πρωτοτύπους*) copies in the possession of Jews, as well as the editions of the Septuagint version, and of the translations executed respectively by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. He determined to write commentaries on the *whole* scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Jerome inform us, that he actually did write commentaries on all the books of Scripture. "He had always short-hand writers,

(ταχυγράφοι,) to the number of seven, within his call, when he was dictating; he relieved them, one after the other, at stated intervals. He had also, at the same time, an equal number of copyists, (βιβλιογράφοι,) as well as young persons of the female sex, skilled in caligraphy, who wrote under his direction. The piety of a friend, converted through his instrumentality, supplied all the necessary funds, and enabled him to devote himself with inexpressible zeal to the study of the Divine oracles, and the composition of his commentaries."

The amount of his labours on the Scriptures seems more than human; and it was not without reason that antiquity called him, "the man with bowels of brass," and "the man of adamant," (χαλκέντερος—*adamantius*.) Thus, though even in the time of Eusebius, only a hundred years after his death, a great portion of his works were already lost, and though many portions more have perished since the age of Eusebius, the collection, published by Huet,[1] of his exegetical writings still extant, consists of two folio volumes; while the whole of his extant works, edited by Delarue,[2] consist of four folio volumes. Without referring either to his famous *Hexapla*, or to his immense labours on the Old Testament, we may convey some notion of his labours on the New, by repeating, after Eusebius and Cave, the list merely of his *Exegetical Works*, (ἐξηγητικῶν,) of his *Scholia*, (or collections of brief notes,) and of his *Homilies*, (or more popular tracts,) on record.

On the *Gospel of John*, a commentary in thirty-two volumes, the earlier written in the year 222, and the later in 237; besides a large number of homilies, of which there remain only two.

On *Matthew*, in 244, a commentary in twenty-five books, besides scholia, and numerous homilies.

On *Mark*, dissertations, of which he himself speaks elsewhere, but which have been all lost.

On *Luke*, five volumes, besides thirty-nine homilies, which Jerome has preserved in Latin.

On the *Acts*, homilies.

On the *Epistle to the Romans*, a commentary in twenty volumes, part of which Ruffinus has preserved to us in his Latin translation.

[1] Rouen, 1668, with a Latin translation. [2] Paris, 1759.

On the First Epistle *to the Corinthians*, and on the Epistles to the *Ephesians* and to the *Colossians*, a commentary in several books.

On the Epistle to the *Galatians*, five volumes, besides dissertations and scholia.

On the First Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, and on the Epistle to *Titus*, exegetical discourses, of which *Jerome* and *Pamphylus* have preserved to us a portion.

On the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, a commentary, homilies, and exegetical discourses.

Lastly, on the Apocalypse, an exposition, which he himself mentions in his thirtieth dissertation on *Matthew*, but of which no other trace is known to exist.

To justify the importance we attach to Origen's testimony in the history of the canon, it would be necessary to enter into details to shew, from the labours of one man, with what ardour, at so early a period as a century after the death of John, the churches studied the scriptures of the New Testament; it would be necessary to convey an adequate idea of the immensity of the Biblical labours of this great man, achieved 103 years before the Council of Nice.

39. Origen furnishes us with two catalogues of the books that were regarded in his time as canonical. The first of these catalogues is directly given us in the eighth of his homilies, on the book of *Joshua*, (as preserved to us in the Latin translation by Ruffinus;) the other is derived from references and quotations contained in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, a work 100 years after the time of Origen.[1]

40. We shall first examine the direct testimony of Origen, expressed incidentally in his commentary on the book of *Joshua*. It will be seen that he there gives our present canon entire, without the omission or addition of a single book.

Alluding to the trumpets, at the sound of which the walls of Jericho fell, he says:—"When our Lord Jesus Christ came in the flesh, (He whose advent Jesus the son of Nun prefigured,) He made His apostles walk as priests, bearing the trumpets of the grand and heavenly doctrine of the preached word. It was *Matthew*

[1] Hist. Eccl., book vi., 25.

who, in his Gospel, first sounded the sacerdotal clarion. Then *Mark*, then *Luke*, then *John*, each in succession blew his trumpet. After them *Peter* bursts forth with the two trumpets of his epistles, (*Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis.*) Then comes *James*, and then *Jude*. Then comes John, to send forth, in addition to his previous blasts, fresh sounds of his trumpet by his *epistles* and *Apocalypse* (*addit nihilominus atque et Joannes tuba canere per epistolas suas et Apocalypsin;*) and so also does Luke, in putting forth his *Acts of the Apostles*. Last comes, in his turn, he who said, (1 Cor. iv. 9,) '*I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last.*' When he awoke the thunders of his trumpets by *his fourteen epistles*, (*et in quatuordecim epistolarum suarum culminans tubis,*) he overturned from their very foundations the walls of Jericho,—all the war-engines of idolatry, all the tenets of false philosophy."

This direct testimony of Origen comprehends, as we have seen, all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, without excepting even one; but his evidence is, notwithstanding, by no means at variance with the historical distinction we have adopted in reference to certain books of the canon. All these books, as we have stated after Eusebius, were received *by most people*, (πλείστοις.) All of them, as we have just seen, were received by Origen. The twenty books of the *first canon* had never been called in question in the churches of God, as they have never been since that time. Neither do the two books of our *second-first canon* appear to have been called in question during the early part of the century, at the commencement of Origen's literary career. They were now soon to be attacked, the one in the East and the other in the West; and we shall perceive in the second form of Origen's testimony, which has been preserved to us, that though he himself received the Second Epistle of Peter, and the two brief epistles of John, some of his contemporaries, however, for some time hesitated to admit their Divine authority.

41. The second form of Origen's testimony is as follows:—It is not presented to us directly by that great man himself, but by Eusebius, who (in the fourth book of his "Ecclesiastical History," ch. xxv.,) states that he took it from the works of Origen, specifying the first of his books on the Gospel of Matthew, the fifth book of

his *exegetical* discourses on the Gospel of *John*, and one of his homilies on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

"Origen," he says, "faithful to the canon of the Church, (*τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα*,) testifies that there are only four Gospels. He says: 'This I have received from tradition regarding the four Gospels, which alone have been universally and unanimously recognised in the Church of God all over the earth,'" (*ἃ καὶ μόνα ἀναντίῤῥητά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ*.) Then, after speaking of these Gospels, he carefully distinguishes the First Epistle of Peter, as uncontroverted, (*ὁμολογουμένην*,) from the second, in regard to which some entertained doubts, (*ἐστιν καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ*,)[1] though he himself still maintained the canonicity of all the books of Scripture. In the same way he is at pains to state, respecting the two brief epistles of John, that all do not regard them as genuine, (*ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι*.)

As to the Apocalypse, it was, in Origen's time, still uncontroverted; and in mentioning it he makes no allusion to its having been ever called in question. In regard to the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, he gives no intimation that anybody doubted its canonicity; he merely remarks that, owing to the elegance of its style, some doubted, *not* its *canonicity*, (this is specially deserving of attention,) but its being a production of *Paul's*. He does not express on this point any decided opinion of his own, but he is at pains to add, that "if any church receives it as an epistle of Paul, it ought to be held in honour even on that very account, (*αὕτη εὐδοκιμείσθω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ*·) for it was not on light grounds (*οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ*) that the early Church had handed it down as a production of Paul's, (*οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι*.)"

42. It thus distinctly follows from the indirect as well as from the direct testimony of Origen, that our historical division of the canon is duly warranted.

We again briefly review Origen's testimony:—

(1.) That great man received the canon exactly as we have it at the present day.

(2.) All the churches continued unanimously to receive, as at all times, the twenty books of the first canon.

[1] See on this our 341st and following propp.

(3.) They still received, likewise, the two books of the second-first canon.

(4.) Some doubted the canonicity of the Second Epistle of Peter and of the two brief epistles of John.

(5.) Origen, according to Eusebius, makes no mention of any opposition made, in his time, to the Epistle of James, or to that of Jude. Neither does he expressly say, indeed, that he himself admitted the divine authority of these epistles; but this is a manifest inadvertence of Eusebius, as Origen, in different parts of his works, mentions the Epistle of Jude more than fifteen times, and distinctly calls it a *divine Scripture.*[1]

(6.) Lastly, some, on account of the elegancy of the style, doubted Paul's authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews; its canonicity had never yet been called in question.

Section Fourth.

THE CATALOGUE OF EUSEBIUS.

43. As the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius, published in the early part of the fourth century, and before the Council of Nice, is going to furnish us with our third catalogue of the books of the New Testament, we think it indispensable to review, with attention, the life and merits of its author.

This illustrious bishop has been justly styled the "father or founder of ecclesiastical history." He is not only the most ancient, but the only historian of the primitive Church. The work of Hegesippus, a hundred years earlier, consists merely of detached narratives, (μερικὰς δηγήσεις,)[2] recording the more or less uncertain traditions of apostolic days. Eusebius, on the contrary, collecting all the documents of the preceding ages, and consulting innumerable writings, had determined to exhibit, in ten books, a consecutive view of the labours, sufferings, and successes of the Church, from the days of Jesus Christ to the fall of Licinius, in 324. He made a special point to give, as he proceeded, a particular account of the writings (now lost) of the Church's early teachers. Valesius, (Henri de Valois,) in the preface to his beautiful edition of

[1] See Book iv. of this work, art. on Jude, prop. 385.

[2] This is the expression of Eusebius, (Eccl. Hist., book i., chap. i.)

the principal ancient ecclesiastical historians, remarks that none of the ecclesiastical historians whom his example raised up has entered on the field he had gone over, but, on the contrary, all of them, by commencing their narratives at the point where he had closed his, appear to have wished to leave entire the glory his work had acquired.

Accordingly, the ten books of Eusebius will ever remain the great repertory where ecclesiastical writers will go to find whatever is known, in connexion with their subject, regarding the first three centuries; and whoever would obtain from this source an accurate account of the early vicissitudes of the Church, or of the history of the canon, must have Eusebius lying constantly on his table. Had the work of Eusebius been lost, like so many others, our means of becoming acquainted with Christian antiquities, though, as it is, far from ample, would have been limited in the extreme; a circumstance, to which we shall have occasion to revert, being the scantiness of authentic documents relating to the apostolic age and the first half of the second century. After setting aside, as is necessary to do, the Pastor of Hermas, the Apostolic Constitutions, and the spurious Epistles of Barnabas, of Ignatius, and of Clement, very little indeed remains. The whole amount consists of five or six authentic epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, with accounts of their martyrdom, and the beautiful anonymous letter addressed to Diognetus.

Many other works of Eusebius, written, for the most part, before his "Ecclesiastical History," are still extant. There are his "Evangelical Preparation," in fifteen books, written in the year 315; his "Evangelical Demonstration," in twenty books, (of which there remain only ten,) written about the same period; his valuable "Chronicle," the original of which is lost, but an Armenian version of which was discovered during the last century; his "Defence of Origen;" his "Life (or Panegyric) of Constantine;" his "History of the Martyrs of Palestine;" and a commentary on various parts of Scripture. The most important, however, of all his writings will always be his "Ecclesiastical History." No man could have been better qualified than this learned bishop for such an undertaking. Born about the year

270, he became in 315 bishop of that Cæsarea in Palestine where his accomplished friend Pamphilus, successor to Origen, had taught, and where he had recently been martyred. Eusebius, both a scholar and a courtier, was highly esteemed by the Emperor Constantine, who frequently invited him to the imperial table, as well as did him the honour of becoming his epistolary correspondent. Eusebius had access to the state archives, as well as to the rich libraries established at Cæsarea by Pamphilus, and at Jerusalem by the bishop Alexander. All those works, now lost to our scholars, are only known to them by the fragments quoted by Eusebius. The important writings of Aristion, Quadratus, Aristides, Hegesippus, Papias, Meliton, Apollonius, had all passed through his hands, so that his decisions respecting the Scriptures were formed with the aid of sources no longer in existence. Eusebius, moreover, by his brilliant endowments, as well as by his rank, exercised a high influence in the Church. He had even been offered the Patriarchate of Antioch, which he had the wisdom to decline. In the famous Council of Nice, we find him on the right of Constantine's golden throne, and occupying the first place among the bishops. Many of the letters that prince addressed to him are still extant; and there is one among them we cannot refrain from quoting, as it relates to the canon. "Dear brother," (*Ἀδελφὲ ἀγαπητέ,*) said the emperor, "I intrust to your prudence the task of having fifty copies (*σωμάτια*) of the divine Scriptures (*τῶν θείων δηλαδὴ γραφῶν*) copied on precious parchment, and in the way you may deem best fitted for the use of the Church and the solemn lessons from the Divine word, (*παρὰ τῆς τῶν θείων ἀναγνωσμάτων ἐπισκευῆς.*) You will employ for this purpose persons the most skilled in the art of *caligraphy;* and, to accelerate the work, letters of our clemency have been addressed to the government treasurer, and two public carriages have been put at your disposal."

If, by one of those unforeseen occurrences that Divine Goodness from time to time accords to the Church, one of these manuscripts, more ancient than any at present known, were suddenly brought to light, as were but of late the palaces of Nineveh, or the papyri in the Egyptian tombs, how precious a prize to sacred literature would the relic prove!

Eusebius, then, viewed as a witness who lived at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth, possesses all the literary qualifications we could desire; but, before we begin to examine him, we must remember that in other respects his sentiments and character are not always so worthy of confidence as his learning.

As to his literary attainments, they are freely acknowledged, even by his most severe detractors.[1] *Jerome* calls him a man of great learning, (*vir doctissimus;*)[2] but he immediately adds, "I do not, however, say he was sound in the catholic faith, though very learned," (*doctissimum; dixi, non catholicum.*) "Whom could you find," he says further, "more intelligent, more learned, more eloquent, than Eusebius, that abettor of Origen?"[3] "We admit his erudition," (πολυμαθίαν,) says *Antipater of Botsra;* "but we combat his doctrinal views."[4] "If," says *Scaliger*, "by *learned* is to be understood one who has read a great deal, we cannot refuse to Eusebius that appellation; but if true learning implies judgment, combined with an extensive knowledge of books, we must reserve the title for others." "That he was most extensively acquainted with books," (πολυίστωρ,) says Antipater, elsewhere, "and familiar with everything in the whole range of ancient literature, I most readily grant; for, having imperial resources at his command, it was easy for him to procure whatever he required."

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that, while we place the fullest reliance in Eusebius's erudition, we should regard his judgment and religious character with more reserve.[5] During imperial persecutions some doubts had been entertained regarding the stability of his faith. The times were evil; and the philosophy of the latter half of the third century had cast a shade over his belief, as it had over that of so many others, and prepared followers for the impious views of Arius. This heresiarch, who was born about the same time as Eusebius, (270,) had been spreading his poison since the year 312; and had found among

[1] See Valesius, "Veterum Testimonia," under the head "Eusebius."

[2] Book ii., against Rufinus.

[3] Ep. 65.

[4] Book i., in reply to Eusebius's "Defence of Origen."

[5] We shall afterwards have to complain of the prejudiced manner in which he speaks of Jude and the Apocalypse.

the bishops of the time a host of accomplices. Eusebius was one of them. He publicly defended the Arian cause against the bishop of Alexandria, and even became, subsequently, one of Athanasius's persecutors. When, at the Council of Tyre, (in 335,) the bishop Potamon, who had had one of his eyes torn out for the faith, saw him take his seat as one of the judges of that great servant of God, he was unable to restrain his indignation. "Is it fitting in you, Eusebius," he exclaimed, while bursting into tears, "to sit there to judge the innocent Athanasius? Who could endure such a sight? Tell me, were we not both thrown into prison during the persecution? How did it happen that you came out of it safe and sound, whilst I lost an eye for maintaining the truth, unless it was that you sacrificed to idols, or promised to do so?"

The manner in which Eusebius expressed himself on doctrinal points became, it is true, very different after the Council of Nice; but the times were changed. "Doubts were entertained regarding his sincerity," says the historian *Socrates*.[1] Accordingly he was called the "*double-tongued*," (δίγλωσσος)—as he had never ceased to shew himself a friend to the Arians and an enemy to the orthodox.

Whatever may have been his real convictions, his work will always be of inestimable value to the history of the canon. We even think that his bias against certain doctrines, and the philosophic and latitudinarian turn of his mind, in making him lean to the merely human side of the question, render him, perhaps, a witness of greater weight in any inquiry like the present, as has been said of the historian Josephus, and of the historian Gibbon, respecting the fulfilment of prophecy.

44. Eusebius, in the twenty-fifth chapter of the third book of his history, states with great precision what, according to him, was the opinion of all ancient ecclesiastical writers as to the canon. To give more precision to his statement, he divides the Scriptures into books *recognised* and books controverted—(into ὁμολογούμενα, and ἀντιλεγόμενα.) As, however, the invaluable chapter to which we refer is the starting-point of nearly all the works that have

[1] Hist. Eccl., book i., chap. 23.

been written on the canon, it is of importance that, before proceeding further, we should distinctly explain what Eusebius exactly means by these two expressions.

Were we to attend merely to the etymology and ordinary use of the words, we might imagine that by ὁμολογούμενα, Eusebius wishes to denote books recognised in some portion or other of the churches of God; and that by ἀντιλεγόμενα, he wishes to express simply books not recognised. This, however, is not his meaning. He employs these distinctive terms without any reference to the *extent*, more or less universal, of the *recognition* of these sacred books by the churches of God.

Accordingly, in the mouth of Eusebius, the ὁμολογούμενα are "the Scriptures universally, unrestrictedly, and uniformly recognised from the first as Divine by all churches and all ecclesiastical writers." It is in this sense, also, that he is to be understood as employing the expression, *ratified* or *sanctioned* books, (κυρωτέον,) —*catholic* or *universal* books—*testamental*, (ἐνδιάθηκα,) contained in the collection forming the New Testament—*uncontroverted*, (ἀναμφίλεκτα,)—*unquestioned*, (ἀναντίῤῥητα.)

On the other hand, *controverted* books (ἀντιλεγόμενα) far from signifying, in the phraseology of Eusebius, books *not recognised*, (as the etymology might seem to indicate,) denote books which, *though recognised by most churches*, (γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πόλλοις,) *though recognised also by most ecclesiastical writers*, (ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γινωσκομένοις,) were not recognised by all churches, and by all ecclesiastical writers; or, at least, were not universally recognised without certain restrictions or some hesitation.

45. Those books of Holy Scripture which Eusebius places in the first of these divisions, that is, among the ὁμολογούμενα, "because," as he says, "all ancient teachers and the ancient churches had uniformily regarded them as divine," are not merely the *twenty* books that form our first canon, but also the *two* books which constitute our second-first canon; so that, according to Eusebius rightly understood, the class of ὁμολογούμενα comprehends the thirty-five thirty-sixths of the New Testament.

The reader will naturally desire to have in view the precise expressions used by Eusebius. The chapter to which we now

refer, is entitled, "*Of the Divine scriptures which are uncontroverted,* (*ὁμολογούμενα,*) *and of those which are not.*" He begins by saying, "It is proper here to recapitulate what we have stated regarding the books of the New Testament. We must place first the holy quaternion of the Gospels, (*τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτύν,*) and after them the *Acts of the Apostles.* After this last must be inserted in the list *the Epistles of Paul;* then that Epistle of *John* which is called the *first,* (*τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν*) and we must, in like manner, admit as divine the Epistle of *Peter,* (*καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν Πέτρου κυρωτέον ἐπιστολήν.*) Then should be inserted, if thought proper, *the Apocalypse of John* (*ἐπὶ τούτου τακτέον, εἰ γὲ φανείη, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου,*) about which we shall, in due order, state our opinion." "*These, then, are the uncontroverted books,* (*καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις.*")

46. The scriptures which Eusebius ranks in the second class, that of *ἀντιλεγόμενα,* are the five brief and late epistles—the Second of Peter, those of James and Jude, and the last two of John. "These scriptures which have been controverted," says he, "though received by most people, and recognised by most ecclesiastical writers, (*ὁμοίως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γνωρισκομένας,*) and publicly read, along with the other catholic epistles, in most churches, (*μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις,*) have experienced some opposition, and are less quoted by ancient writers."

47. Apart from these twenty-seven books of the New Testament, apart even from the *controverted* books, (*ἀντιλεγόμενα,*) Eusebius classes those works which are to be rejected, and which he calls *spurious,* (*νόθα.*) At the same time he distinguished this third class into two sorts. The first comprehending such as were harmless, or even instructive, but had been improperly attributed to apostles, or companions of apostles, as the *Acts of Paul,* the *Shepherd of Hermas,* the *Apocalypse of Peter,* the *Epistle of Barnabas,* the *Apostolic Constitutions.* The second consisted of spurious (*νόθα*) works that were heretical and mischievous, which he calls *absurd and impious,* (*ἄτοπα καὶ δυσσεβῆ*)—such as the gospels of *Peter, Thomas, Matthias, the Acts of Andrew, of John,* and of other apostles.

"We see," says Dr Thiersch,[1] "by this minute distinction established by Eusebius, but which we could not have inferred either from the etymology of the terms or the tenor of the subject, how clear and definite was the judgment of the Church at that time, as well as the judgment of Eusebius, regarding the limits of the canon—limits which afterwards became laws of the Church."

48. Eusebius, inserting the Epistle to the Hebrews in the class of *uncontroverted books*, though aware of certain doubts regarding it that had been raised at Rome so early as the time of Caius, that is, during the first half of the third century, (as we shall explain in the sequel,) did so because he knew that, from the days of the apostles, it had been uniformly received by all the Greek and Oriental churches. He is at pains to intimate that the *fourteen* epistles of Paul are *well known and unquestionable*, (*Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες*)—but he adds, that it would not be right to overlook the fact that *some persons* (*τινές*) had rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews on the ground of the Roman Church's having controverted Paul's authorship of that epistle. The persons (*τινές*) to whom Eusebius here alludes were evidently *Greeks;* but neither their opinion nor even that of the *Roman Church* had exerted any influence on the churches of Greece and the East; and the learned historian shews that, notwithstanding such doubts, the epistle was, in his estimation, *clearly and unquestionably canonical.*

As to the *Apocalypse*, it may at first seem strange that he does not class it with the *controverted* books, (*ἀντιλεγόμενα,*) as he speaks of it as deemed by some of Divine authority, and by others *spurious.* But as the Apocalypse had never, till the time of *Dionysius* of Alexandria, (about the middle of the third century,) been controverted in the East, where, on the contrary, it had always been regarded as of Divine authority; and as, on the other hand, Dionysius vehemently maintained that it was the work of an ordinary presbyter of the name of John, and, consequently, *spurious;* the controversy being still at its height while Eusebius was writing his history, he could not, before the close of the dis-

[1] Versuch zur Vorstellung des hist. Standpuncts für die Critic der N. T. Schr.

cussion, place it among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. All parties agreed in excluding the Apocalypse from the class of *ἀντιλεγόμενα*· but some insisted that it should be declared of Divine authority, while others maintained it should be pronounced spurious.

The Apocalypse was uncontroverted during the second century, and even till the middle of the third, at which time the party spirit that characterised the philosophic theology of Alexandria, during its contest with the antique millenarian theory, ventured to call in question the authority of that book. This opposition produced hesitation in the minds of the Greek theologians. Eusebius did not remain neutral in this doctrinal controversy; but this did not prevent him from stating the historical points of the question with a faithfulness worthy of respect.

49. We briefly sum up the substance of what we have said to account for Eusebius's having classed the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse among the *uncontroverted* scriptures:—

(1.) These two books had been from the first, and during two centuries, received as of Divine authority by all the churches, both of the East and of the West.

(2.) Subsequently one of these books, the Epistle to the Hebrews, had been always received in the churches of the East, and the other, the Apocalypse, had always continued to be received in the churches of the West.

(3.) When, afterwards, doubts were for a time raised against the Apocalypse in the East, and against the Epistle to the Hebrews in the West, no ancient testimony against either of these books was ever produced, and the only objections brought against them related to alleged incongruities of doctrine and of style, as might be the case at the present day.

We shall afterwards examine the subject of *ἀντιλεγόμενα* more in detail; our object at present being merely to describe the catalogue of Eusebius.

50. In taking this historian, then, as so many other writers have done, for our starting point in establishing the Divine canonicity of the whole New Testament, and in taking our stand with this learned bishop in the year 324, (six months before the Council of Nice,) we may say that we select the very moment in history when the objections brought against these two books had reached the

culminating point. It would be impossible, then, to give a more precise statement of these objections than we do in expressing them under this form. Our threefold division is more rigorous even than that of Eusebius; for, instead of classing, as he does, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse among the uncontroverted books, we assign them a separate position, as they did not attain the rank of uncontroverted, in the unrestricted sense in which the term is employed by Eusebius, till the middle of the third century. In ascending beyond the time of Eusebius, we find the objections gradually diminishing towards this source, and in descending from his time we find them diminishing still more rapidly. The great Origen, who lived before him, received, as we have stated, the entire canon; and never heard of any hesitation among his contemporaries except in reference to the eighty-ninth part of the New Testament.[1] The great Athanasius, only twenty-six years younger than Eusebius, received our canon entire, and, in concluding his list of New Testament scriptures, says, "These books are the fountains of salvation, (*ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου.*) Let no one add to them anything, or take anything from them, (*μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβαλλέτω, μηδὲ τούτων ἀφαιρείσθω τι*)."[2] The famous Council of Laodicea,[3] held only twenty-nine years after that of Nice, received in its catalogue, without one exception, (as we shall by and by see,) all the five brief and late epistles which form our second canon.[4]

We have, then, fully demonstrated that our division of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament into three canons, historically distinct, responds to the most rigorous requirements of sacred criticism, and represents, with the strictest precision, the historical reception of the various books of which that part of Holy Scripture is composed: Twenty books universally, uniformly, and unanimously received from the commencement. Then, two books also received uniformly and universally from their appear-

[1] Eighty-nine verses (the Second Epistle of *Peter* and the last two epistles of John) out of 7959.

[2] In his *Festal Epist.* xxxix., vol. ii., p. 961. Edit. Bened.

[3] It represented the different provinces of Asia, and was ratified by the *Fourth General Council of Constantinople*, by the *General Council of Chalcedon*, and by the *imperial law of Justinian.* The *Code of the Church Universal* fixes it in 364.

[4] See Canons lix. and lx. (prop. 88.)

ance till the middle of the third century, at which time various objections in reference to them began to be raised in some churches, and for a century and a half; yet these objections to their canonicity were not historical, but merely critical. Lastly, five small epistles received by the great bulk of Christendom, though controverted in some churches till the Council of Nice.

CHAPTER VIII.

OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE AND ITS RESULTS.

51. THE Ecumenical Council of Nice was unquestionably one of the most august assemblies on record. The world had never seen anything that could be compared to it. There, among the bishops, from all parts, of whom it was composed, and the elders or deacons who accompanied them, was to be found all that was most learned and most holy in the Church of God: *Hosius*, bishop of Cordova, an old man universally venerated, who had already presided in other synods, and who was the first that attached his signature to the acts of this: *Eustathius*, bishop of Antioch, who delivered the opening address: *Alexander*, the pious bishop of Alexandria, who had been the first to assail Arius, and who had brought with him to Nice the famous *Athanasius*, then a young deacon of Alexandria, about twenty-nine years of age: *James*, bishop of Nisibe in Mesopotamia: *Alexander*, bishop of Byzantium: *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra: *Macarius*, bishop of Jerusalem: *Cecilianus*, bishop of Carthage. Even the bishops of Persia, of Scythia, and of the country of the Goths, were to be seen there, as well as a great number of glorious confessors of Jesus Christ, who had endured imprisonment and torture during the previous persecutions; three bishops of the name of *Nicholas: Spyridion*, bishop of Cyprus, an old man honoured by all: *Paphnutius*, whose right eye had been torn out, and his left hough mutilated with red-hot iron: *Paul*, of Neo-Cæsarea on the Euphrates, who had lost both hands, which Licinius had caused to be burnt off. But, besides these steadfast adherents of the faith, the council counted a great number of members that were followers of Arius, but illustrious for their talents and erudition; such as the two *Eusebiuses, Maris*

of Chalcedon, *Paulinus* of Tyre, *Menophantes* of Ephesus, *Lucius*, a Sarmatian bishop, and many others. The assembly was opened in the imperial palace on the 22d day of May 325, and lasted till the 25th of August.

Section First.

THE COUNCIL MADE NO DECREE ON THE CANON.

52. People often speak of the canon of the New Testament as if the first general council, convoked by Constantine to put an end to all differences that then disturbed the Church, had passed a decree fixing the list of sacred scriptures. There could not be a greater mistake.

We find, it is true, "in that convocation of the whole Church," says Eusebius, "an assembly in which the most eminent servants of God from all the churches of Europe, Africa, and Asia, had met." They passed resolutions, indeed, on the disputes which then shook the Christian world in the East and in the West, and the Scriptures were often mentioned as a work common to the universal Church, but no disagreement on the subject of the canon was ever in question. Not one of the existing documents relating to this council makes the slightest mention of such a matter.

The sacred volume of the Gospels was then placed on a large and lofty throne in the middle of the assembly, to intimate, as in all the earlier general councils,[1] that Scripture is the supreme rule in all controversies; and Constantine the Great, in the speech he himself addressed to the assembled fathers,[2] reminded them that "they had the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in writing," and that the *books of the evangelists and the apostles, and the oracles of the prophets*, teach us clearly and distinctly (σαφῶς) what we are to believe concerning the things of God, and that differences of opinion which arise are to be settled according to the words of divine inspiration (ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν

[1] Le Sueur, Histoire de l'Egl. et de l'Emp., tom. ii., p. 454; tom. iv., pp. 275 and 375; tom. vi., p. 220.

[2] This circumstance is recorded of the Council of Chalcedon and of several others. I have not, however, been able to find in Eusebius, any more more than in Socrates, Sozomen, or Theodoret, the passage whence historians have derived it as far as relates to the Council of Nice.

ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν.)" Finally, the council, precisely in reference to its formula of faith, (μαθήματος,) "declared that its doctrine was entirely grounded on *the divine Scriptures*, (θείων γραφῶν,)" when, in the preamble suggested by Eusebius, it says, "As we have learned it from the Holy Scriptures, this is our creed: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty," &c. Yet, we repeat, the council, amid all these declarations, nowhere indicated the slightest intention of passing a decree respecting the catalogue of the sacred books of the New Testament.

53. It is true that many Romanist theologians, such as Bellarmin,[1] Baronius,[2] Catharin,[3] Binius,[4] constantly thinking of the authority of human tribunals in matters of faith, and of the too compromising case of the apocryphal books, have tried to pass off, on this point, some rash assertions. Notwithstanding the silence of antiquity, and in defiance of all existing documents relating to the assembly at Nice, they pretend to infer from an expression of *Jerome's*, that the council had passed a decree fixing the canon. Jerome, indeed, earnestly urged by several persons to write a commentary on the history of Judith (the canonicity of which he distinctly denied), says, "that he had somewhere read that the Council of Nice had reckoned it among the Holy Scriptures."[5] It is easy, however, to demonstrate that this inference is utterly unwarranted. For,—

(1.) No ancient ecclesiastical writer ever referred to any decision of the Council of Nice on the canon of Scripture.

(2.) The acts of the council do not contain a single word relating to such pretended decision.

(3.) Jerome himself states very distinctly that the book of Judith is not canonical; and even in that "Preface" from which Romanists pretend to derive their argument in its favour, he is at pains to state that "the Hebrews class Judith among those books which cannot be adduced as authority in determining controverted doctrines." Again, in his "Prologus Galeatus," he says, "that book is not in the canon;" and in his commentary on the books

[1] "De Verbo Dei," lib. i., cap. 10.

[2] "Annales," tom. iii., § 137.

[3] "In Cajetan."

[4] Notes on the Council of Laodicea.

[5] Cujus auctoritas ad roboranda illa quæ in contentionem veniunt minus idonea judicatur.

of Solomon, "The Church, it is true, allows it to be read, but does not receive it as one of the canonical scriptures." [1]

(4.) Roman theologians are so well aware of the import of Jerome's opinion on this point that they decline it in all discussions about the Apocrypha.

(5.) Jerome, in the passage in question, does not say that the Council of Nice had received the book of Judith as canonical, but that "certain persons asserted it had." He says merely, *Legitur*. Perhaps some bishop at Nice had quoted some passage of the book; but that would not have proved that the council regarded the book as canonical, and much less does it show that the council passed any decree concerning the canon.

(6.) If the Council of Nice had received that history of Judith as canonical, how could it have happened that the Council of Laodicea, held forty years afterwards, and sanctioned by the General Council of Chalcedon, excluded it from the canon? How could *Eusebius* and *Athanasius*, both present and both powerful in the council, and how could *Hilarius*, who suffered exile for defending its decrees, have all denied its canonicity? How, also, could Basil the Great, how could Gregory of Nazianzus, how could Amphilochius, all three living nearer the time of the council than Jerome, have, in like manner, omitted it in their catalogue of inspired books?

SECTION SECOND.

FROM THE DATE OF THE COUNCIL ALL DISAGREEMENT REGARDING THE CONTROVERTED BOOKS CEASED IN ALL THE CHURCHES OF CHRISTENDOM.

54. Whatever, through the providence of God, (as we shall afterwards demonstrate,) may have been the reserve of the councils in reference to the canon,—a reserve the more striking, as it was entirely unintentional,—it is an unquestionable fact that, within a very short space of time after that solemn assembly of Nice, a remarkable change took place in public opinion, which had been hitherto undecided regarding some of the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. All hesitation forthwith disappeared in one place after another,

[1] Sed eum inter canonicas scripturas non recipit.

till all the churches of Christ throughout the world exhibited that perfect unanimity which, amid every diversity of race and of language, has continued to exist for fifteen hundred years. The council, there can be no doubt, powerfully, though indirectly, contributed to that important result. Having united in the closest intercourse, for the space of three months, the most illustrious and the most enlightened representatives of Christianity, the council afforded them an opportunity of interchanging their views, and comparing their documents, and of thus laying aside all unfounded prejudices, and of becoming unanimously agreed.

It will, therefore, be proper to prove, by quotations, this rapid change in public opinion. We shall not, however, extend the inquiry beyond the fourth century; as, from that period to the present day, the testimonies are so continuous and so abundant as not to require either to be quoted or enumerated.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ELEVEN AUTHENTIC CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

55. THE fathers and the councils of the fourth century have left us no fewer than eleven catalogues of the sacred books, without counting that of Eusebius.

SECTION FIRST.

UNANIMITY OF ALL THE CATALOGUES AS TO THE FIRST CANON, THE SECOND CANON, AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

56. *All these eleven catalogues,* without exception, unanimously recognise as canonical, not only the twenty books that form our first canon, but also the *Epistle to the Hebrews,* and all the five books that Eusebius calls *ἀντιλεγόμενα,* and that form our *second canon.*

Accordingly, from the date of the Council of Nice, all difference of opinion, at least in the catalogues of the age, everywhere disappeared regarding both the two canons and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

SECTION SECOND.

CATALOGUES OF THE FATHERS AND CATALOGUES OF THE COUNCILS.

57. Of these eleven authentic catalogues of the fourth century, nine have been left us by the fathers and two by the councils.

It will be necessary to give a detailed account of both these classes of catalogues, and this we shall do in the next two chapters.

CHAPTER X.

THE NINE CATALOGUES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY GIVEN BY THE FATHERS.

SECTION FIRST.

ONLY THREE OF THEM OMIT THE APOCALYPSE.

58. OF these nine catalogues left us by the fathers of the fourth century, there are three—those of Cyril, Gregory the Divine, and Philastrius—which, while agreeing entirely on every other point with the canon of our churches, make as yet no mention of the Apocalypse, or state, as Amphilochius does, that many still entertain doubts regarding it.

"Notwithstanding the entire agreement of the churches after the Council of Nice," says *Hug*, (in his "Introduction,") "the doctrinal discussions against the 'millenarians' had been too keen in certain parts, and were still too recent to permit that book's general and unanimous restoration to its place in the canon."

59. The first of these three catalogues is that of *Cyril*, who is regarded by the Greek Church as one of her principal saints, and who was patriarch of Jerusalem twenty-four years after the Council of Nice. He died so late as 386; but before being raised to that important see, he had exercised, in Jerusalem itself,[1] the functions of a pastor and catechist. His works consist almost exclusively of eighteen *Catecheses*, (or didactic lectures,) addressed to catechumens on the principal points of Christian doctrine; and of five *Catecheses*, styled *Mystagogical*, addressed to communicants on the two sacraments of the Church. "They were extemporaneous,

[1] He informs us he continued to catechise in 347. See his sixth Catechesis; or *Cave*, (Hist. Litt., vol. i., p. 211.)

(σχεδιασθεῖσαι,) as he himself informs us, and composed with great simplicity, in order to be intelligible to all."[1]

His catalogue is contained in his fourth *Catechesis*,[2] under the title, "*Of the Divine Scriptures*," (*Περὶ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν.*)

"This is what we are taught by the *inspired* scriptures of the Old and the New Testament; for there is but one and the same God in both, who in the Old foretells God manifested in the New."

"Learn, then, from the Church, with a sincere desire to be instructed, (φιλομαθῶς ἐπίγνωσκε παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας,) what are the books of the Old Testament, and what those of the New, and read nothing of what is apocryphal. . . . . Read (ἀναγίνωσκε) the Divine scriptures, the twenty-two books of the Old Testament;[3] . . . . but have nothing to do with any book that is apocryphal. Study earnestly those books only (ταύτας μόνας μελέτα σπουδαίως) which we read and recognise openly in the Church, (ἃς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ παῤῥησίας ἀναγινγνώσκομεν.)"

"The apostles and the ancient bishops, those office-bearers of the Church who have transmitted to us the Scriptures, were undoubtedly better informed and more circumspect than thou. See, then, that thou, a son of the Church, do not falsify her ordinances, (μὴ παραχάραττε τοὺς θεσμούς.)"

Of the twenty-two books of the New Testament, he says: "As to the New Testament, there are *four Gospels*, all the rest being false and pernicious. The Manichæans, too, have written a *Gospel according to Thomas*, which, under the perfume, so to speak, of an evangelical surname, leads the souls of the simple to perdition. But receive, likewise, the *Acts* of the twelve apostles, and also the *seven Catholic Epistles* of James and Peter, John and Jude; and lastly, as a seal put on all the disciples, the fourteen Epistles of Paul. But let all the other books be placed outside, and classed in a secondary rank, (τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα

[1] They were published at Paris, in Latin, in the year 1564; and in Latin and Greek in the year 1720.

[2] Chap. xxxiii., and following. Ed. Bened. Venice, 1763.

[3] Is it needful to repeat that it was the fancy of the ancient Jews to reduce their thirty-nine books to twenty-two, the number of letters in the alphabet? Thus they reckoned the twelve minor prophets as one book, and counted as one Ruth with Judges, Ezra with Nehemiah, Jeremiah with the Lamentations, first and second Samuel, first and second Kings, first and second Chronicles.

ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ.) As to all such books as are neither read nor recognised in the churches, (ὅσα μὲν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται,) neither read nor recognise them as far as thou art concerned."

We perceive here, and we shall perceive in the other catalogues, that besides the *canonical scriptures*, two other sorts of books had a distinct character assigned them. These were, first, such as, without being canonical, might be read in the churches, and were, accordingly, called Deutro-canonical, or *Ecclesiastical;* and, secondly, such as were not allowed to be read in churches, even as books of a secondary rank, and were therefore called *apocryphal.*

Cyril, then, though agreeing on every point with the canon of our churches, had not yet restored the *Apocalypse* to the rank it held during the previous centuries; but, like Eusebius, assigned it a secondary place, (ἐν δευτέρῳ.) He quotes it very distinctly, and that three times, (Apoc. xii. and xvii.,) in his fifth *Catechesis*, chapters xii., xiii., and xvii.

60. Gregory of Nazianzus. — The second catalogue is that of the celebrated Gregory of Nazianzus, who, according to Cave, was born in the year in which the first general council was held; and at the age of fifty-six, was made patriarch of Constantinople about the time of the second. He died eight years afterwards, (in 389,) at the age of sixty-four.[1]

That great man, a son of the bishop of Nazianzus, by whom he was ordained to the holy ministry, had acquired a brilliant reputation during the course of his studies at Cæsarea, Alexandria, and Athens. He administered the see of Nazianzus during the old age of his father, and had distinguished himself by his strict conscientiousness, as well as by his pre-eminent talents, when he was appointed by the Council of Antioch, in 378, to proceed to Constantinople, for the purpose of opposing Arianism, and erecting the banner of divine truth there. The task assigned him was arduous; his life was more than once in danger; the Arians had for forty years been in possession of all the public churches there, and their audacity was remarkable; but Gregory

[1] These dates are those given by *Cave*, (Hist. Lit., p. 246;) but *Fabricius* (Bibl. Græc. viii., 384) states that he was born in 300, and died in 391.

succeeded in bringing back, in a short space of time, a large number of them to the side of truth. He collected an audience in a private chapel belonging to one of his relatives, which was afterwards called the "Church of the Resurrection," (*τῆς ἀναστάσεως*,) as in it commenced the resurrection, as it were, of the national Church. A crowd of eager adherents were regularly attending his powerful preaching; when at length the Emperor Theodosius, declaring himself his patron, procured his promotion to the patriarchate of Constantinople, with the unanimous consent of one hundred and fifty bishops, convened in a general council for that purpose. The arrival, however, of the bishops of Egypt, towards the end of the council, raised so violent a storm against his election, that, for the peace of the Church, he deemed it his duty to resign his office, and return to Cappadocia, to spend the remainder of his life in devotion, labour, and retirement.

A pious believer, an elegant poet, a preacher of great power and majesty, he was specially respected by the age in which he lived as an unrivalled divine. He was, accordingly, surnamed the Divine, (*ὁ θεολόγος*.) "To oppose, in any point," says Rufinus,[1] "the views of Gregory was, in the sight of the Lord, and of the churches, downright heresy." (*Id obtinuit apud Dominum et ecclesias Dei meriti, ut quicunque ausus fuerit doctrinæ ejus in aliquo refragari, et hoc ipso quia ipse sit magis hæreticus arguatur.*) His writings have been preserved to us almost entire. They consist of sermons, poems, and letters. His catalogue, which forms the whole subject of one of his poems, is entitled, "*The Genuine* (*γνησίων*) *Books of Inspired Scripture.*"

After a very accurate enumeration of the books of the Old Testatment, (in the first nineteen verses,) we have these lines:—

Ἀρχαίας μὲν ἔθηκα δύω καὶ εἴκοσι βίβλους,
Τοῖς ἑβραίων γράμμασιν ἀντιθέτους.
Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραφεν ἑβραίοις θαύματα Χριστοῦ,
Μάρκος δ' Ἰταλίᾳ, Λουκᾶς Ἀχαιΐδι·
Πᾶσι δ' Ἰωάννης κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφοίτης. . . . .

"I have given the twenty-two books of the Old Testament corresponding to the letters of the Hebrews. Then, *Matthew* wrote for the Hebrews the wonders of Christ; *Mark* for Italy;

[1] Prol. in libr. Gregorii.

Luke for Achaia; but John for all—John the great herald of arms, who traversed the heavens. Then, the *Acts* of the Apostles, and the fourteen Epistles of *Paul*, and the seven Catholic Epistles—one of *James*, two of *Peter*, and again three of *John;* that of Jude is the last. Thou hast them all; and if any one besides be presented to you, it is not one of the genuine inspired scriptures, (*οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις.*)"

61. The canon of Gregory is thus, we perceive, the same as our own, with the single exception of the *Apocalypse*. He, however, alludes to it very clearly (in his twenty-fourth verse) in calling John the great herald who traversed the heavens. *Andreas*, therefore, bishop of Cæsarea, who wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse towards the end of the fifth century, states that Gregory the Divine regarded the Apocalypse "as inspired and authentic."[1] We read, in *Lardner*,[2] two passages in which the same Gregory expressly appeals to the Apocalypse of John: once, when he says, "As John teaches me in his Apocalypse, (*ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως·*) and a second time, when he quotes the eighth verse of the fourth chapter of the Apocalypse: *Καὶ ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ.*"

However, we are rather inclined to think that Gregory of Nazianzus, like Cyril and Eusebius, had not, at the period in question, restored that inspired book to the rank of canonical, in the strict sense of the term, and merely assigned it a place among the books called ecclesiastical,—permitted to be read publicly in the churches of God.[3]

62. Philastrius.—The third catalogue is that of *Philastrius*, the friend of Ambrose, and bishop of Brescia. He flourished about the year 380. He had travelled much in the cause of the truth, and had valiantly contended against Arianism. Augustin mentions having met with him at Milan, in the house of Ambrose.[4] A work of his is still extant, entitled, *De Hæresibus*. It is to be

[1] Bib. Pat. Max., v. 1590. *Constat namque beatos illos viros, Gregorium theologum, Cyrillum Alexandrinum, etc., divinum fideque dignum non uno loco tradere.*

[2] Tom. iv., p. 287.

[3] We find among the works of the same father another catalogue, which some attribute to Amphilochius, and of which we shall speak further on, (thesis 82.)

[4] At the beginning of his book *De Hæresibus*.

found in vol. v. of the great library of the fathers ;[1] and in the 40th and 41st articles of that book, his catalogue of the books of the New Testament is given as follows :—

"*Article* 40. It has been established as a rule," says he, "by the apostles and their successors, that nothing else should be read in the Church (*non aliud legi in ecclesia debere in Catholica*) but the *Law* and the *Prophets ;* and with the Gospels, the *Acts of the Apostles,* and the *thirteen Epistles of Paul,* and *seven others,*— two of *Peter,* three of *John,* one of *Jude,* and one of *James ;* which are all annexed to the *Acts of the Apostles.* As to the apocryphal writings, though they ought to be read by *advanced Christians for edification,* (*etsi legi debent morum causâ a perfectis,*) they ought not to be read by all, because heretics, ignorant of the truth, have added or retrenched many things as they thought proper."

63. On reading merely this 40th article, we might suppose that Philastrius, while fully recognising the whole of our first canon, as well as our second, did not receive our second-first. This, however, would be a mistake, as far as regards the Epistle to the Hebrews ; in his 41st article, (entitled, "Heresy of certain persons touching the Epistle to the Hebrews,") he adds :—

"Others maintain that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by Paul, but by the Apostle Barnabas, or by Clement, bishop of Rome. Others, again, assert that Luke had written an epistle to the Laodiceans ; and that, as indiscreet persons had added various things to it, it is not read in the Church ; or if some read it, it is only the thirteen Epistles of Paul that are regularly read to the people in the Church, and the Epistle to the Hebrews is not read except occasionally, (*nisi tredecim epistolæ ipsius, et ad Hebræos interdum.*) That epistle being written in a flowing and agreeable style (*rhetorice scripsit, sermone plausibili*) has given rise to the impression that Paul was not its writer. The expression, Ἰησοῦν· πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν, (Heb. iii. 23,) has also led some to reject it. Some, moreover, reject it for what it says of repentance, as sanctioning the views of the Novatians, (Heb. vi. 4, and following.)"

[1] Bib. Pat. Max., p. 711.

We have thus seen that the catalogue of Philastrius (the third and last of the catalogues of the fourth century which omit the Apocalypse) regards as heretics those who denied that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul. Only, in admitting into the canon the Epistle to the Hebrews, Philastrius is at pains to state the three intrinsic grounds of the prejudice entertained by some of the Latins against that part of Holy Scripture.

We shall have occasion to return to the subject in Book Third.

SECTION II.

ALL THE OTHER SIX CATALOGUES OF THE FATHERS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY ARE ENTIRELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANON OF OUR CHURCHES.

64. All other catalogues drawn up by fathers of the fourth century were, on all points, identical with the catalogue which has been received for the last 1500 years by all the churches in Christendom. Those catalogues are,—1. That of *Athanasius the Great*, who was only twenty-six years younger than Eusebius; 2. That of another contemporary father, whose name is unknown to us; 3. That of *Epiphanius*, archbishop of Cyprus, only fourteen years (or, according to others, only four years) younger than Athanasius; 4. That of *Jerome*, secretary to Damasus, bishop of Rome, and thirty-five years younger than Epiphanius; 5. That of *Rufinus*, a presbyter of Aquileia, the intimate friend of Jerome before becoming his adversary, and, like him, versed in literature, both of the East and of the West, owing to his residence at Jerusalem from 371, and at Rome from 396; 6. That of *Augustin*, the holy bishop of Hippo, twenty-three years younger than Jerome.

We shall present to the reader a brief examination of the preceding catalogues respectively.

65. Athanasius.—The testimony of this great man is of the very highest importance, on account of his rank, his talents, and character, and the whole of his career. He was unquestionably the most illustrious personage of his time, not merely from his steadfastness in the faith, but the extent of his erudition, and the energy and clearness of his intellect, that ever shine forth in his

writings, (λέγειν τε καὶ νοεῖν ἱκανόν, says Sozomen;)[1] but also because his incessant contending against Arius and the secular power, which, for the most part, was on the side of Arius, filled up fifty years of his life, and compelled him to make a personal visit to every part of the empire. From Alexandria he had to repair to Tyre, Constantinople, Rome, Belgium, and to the deserts of the Thebaid. Born in 296, as is thought, he lived more than eighty years, and was a bishop for more than half-a-century. Everybody knows how wonderfully he distinguished himself, notwithstanding his youth, (still under thirty,) in the General Council of Nice, and that, only five months after the close of the council, he became patriarch of Alexandria. Persecuted by the two Eusebiuses, more than once deprived of his see, banished, even condemned to death, he had, during his travels and long exile, an opportunity of ascertaining, better than any other man, the mind of all the churches of the East and of the West regarding the Scriptures. His testimony is, therefore, the most accurate expression possible of the mind of the Church universal in the fourth century. "His life,"[2] says Sozomen, "is the model of the episcopate, and his doctrine the rule of orthodoxy, (νόμος δ'ὀρθοδοξίας τὰ ἐκείνου δόγματα.)"

- After what has been said, we proceed to shew the immense difference that exists, as to firm belief in the entire Scriptures, between his language and that of Eusebius, his contemporary, but the friend of Arius.

66. "As for us," he says, in his "Festal Epistle,"[3] "we have the Holy Scriptures for our salvation; but I am afraid, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, (2 Cor. xi. 3,) that a small number of simple persons have been turned away from simplicity and holiness by the wickedness of men, and induced to read apocryphal works, from having been misled by the identity of their titles with those of genuine books. It appears to me, therefore, of importance to the Church that I should give a list of these; and, in doing this, I shall borrow the words of Luke,[4] and say, "As *some* have thought

[1] Lib. ii., c. 17. Ed. Valesii, p. 466.

[2] Cave (Scrip. Eccl., tom. i., p. 191) quotes Sozomen, p. 397; but we have not been able to find the words there.

[3] Festal Ep., xxxix., tom. ii., p. 961. Ed. Bened. Paris, 1698.

[4] Luke i. 1–3, paraphrased.

proper to draw up a list of *apocryphal books*, and to mix them with the inspired scriptures, regarding which we have obtained perfect certainty, (ἐπληροφορήθημεν,) from the testimony of the fathers, received from those who were from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, at the request of faithful brethren, to enumerate, in order, *the books held and delivered, and believed as of Divine authority*, (*τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία,*) *that whoever may have been led astray may blame those who have misled them.*"

"The list of the Old Testament books is this," (he then gives them.)

"But we must also enumerate the books of the New Testament. They are as follows:—"The *four Gospels—Matthew, Mark, Luke,* and *John.* Then the *Acts of the Apostles,* and the *seven Catholic Epistles* of these apostles; one of *James* and two of *Peter;* then three of *John* and one of *Jude.* There are then fourteen epistles of Paul, in the following order, (*τῇ τάξει γραφόμεναι οὕτως*)—one to the *Romans;* then two to the Corinthians; then (epistles respectively) to the *Ephesians, Philippians,* and *Colossians;* then two to the *Thessalonians,* and one to the *Hebrews;* then, immediately after these, two to *Timothy,* one to *Titus,* and, lastly, one to *Philemon;* and, again, the *Apocalypse* of John."

We feel a pleasure in giving a literal translation of these catalogues, (notwithstanding the repetition of the same terms,) to impress upon the reader the distinct and constant uniformity with which the order of the books (*τάξις*) was, from the beginning, handed down in the Church, though this order was not in accordance with the respective dates of the books. This circumstance, as we shall shew, is not without importance in the history of the canon.

"These books," adds Athanasius, "are the fountains of salvation, to which the thirsty may repair to obtain refreshment from the oracles they contain; for it is only in these books that pious inquirers can learn evangelical truths, (*ἐν τούτοις μόνοις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται.*) Let no person add anything to them, and let no person take anything away from them." . . . .

"For further precision it is necessary to add, that, besides these

books, there are others which, though not *admitted into the canon*, (*οὐ κανονιζόμενα μέν,*) have been stamped (*τετυπωμένα δέ*) as proper to be read by those who, having but recently come among us, are desirous of obtaining pious instruction—the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, Judith and Tobias, and what are called the apostolic institutes, (*καὶ διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων,*) and the Pastor of Hermas. Therefore, beloved, as the former are *canonical*, and the latter proper to be read, to such alone confine your attention, making no mention whatever of *apocryphal* writings, (*οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἀποκρύφων μνήμη.*) These are an invention of heretics, who have written according to their fancy, and have assigned them dates, in order to palm them on the simple as ancient writings."

It is thus perfectly clear that the list given by Athanasius is complete, as was that of Origen, who lived one hundred and fifty years earlier. But even then it was customary to reckon two sorts of writings besides the twenty-seven canonical books. The first was a small number of books which were called *ecclesiastical*, and which might be read in the churches; the second was carefully denounced under the name *apocryphal*. The same distinction will be found in other catalogues.

67. The Anonymous Father.—The second catalogue is that of a contemporary of Athanasius, frequently confounded with him, the Greek text of which is to be found among the collective works of Athanasius, and entitled, "*Synopsis of Holy Scripture.*"[1] This brief composition is admired as "a model of accuracy, sagacity, and learning," according to the Benedictine Fathers, (*tanta cura, sagacitate, eruditione elaborata, ut nihil supra.*) Its contents are as follows:—"All Scripture is held by us Christians as inspired, (*θεόπνευστος.*) It consists, not of indefinite books, but of books definite and recognised as canonical, (*ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὡρισμένα καὶ κεκανονισμένα ἔχει τὰ βιβλία.*) The books of the Old Testament are, (then follows the list.) The canonical books of the New Testament are: The *four Gospels*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, the *seven Catholic Epistles* of different apostles, counted as one book, (he enumerates them in their established order;) the *fourteen Epistles of Paul*, counted as one book, (he enumerates them, too,

[1] Benedictine edition, tom. ii., p. 125, Paris, 1698.

in their established order;) and, in addition to these books, (*ἐπὶ τούτοις*,) there is also the *Apocalypse of John the divine*, received as his, (*δεχθεῖσα ὡς ἐκείνου*,) and recognised by the fathers, who were holy men, and inspired of God, (*καὶ ἐγκριθεῖσα ὑπὸ πάλαι ἁγίων καὶ πνευματοφόρων πατέρων.*)

"Such are the canonical books of the New Testament, which are, as it were, the first fruits, the anchors and props of our faith, inasmuch as they were written and left as a deposit (*καὶ ἐκτεθέντα*) by the apostles of Christ themselves."

68. Epiphanius.—The third catalogue, that of Epiphanius, is to be found in his "Panarium," or treatise "Against Heresies."

The writings of this father, who was born in Palestine, and of Jewish extraction, are, equally, of great value, owing to the vast extent of his literary attainments, and his acknowledged familiarity with ecclesiastical antiquities (*antiquitatum præsertim ecclesiasticarum callentissimus.*)[1] He was master of five languages, (*πεντάγλωσσος*,) says Jerome, "being equally skilled in Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Latin, and Greek." His treatise "Against Heresies" is, in the opinion of Photius, from its copious quotations from Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, and other ancient authors, more rich and more useful than any work written before him on the same subject. "His writings," says Jerome, in another part of his works, "are read and re-read (*lectitantur*) by scholars of real erudition, on account of the matter, (*propter res*,) and by persons of less learning, on account of the style, (*propter verba.*)"

Brought up in Egypt, and perverted to Gnosticism before he was twenty years of age, he had returned to his native country, to put himself under the direction of the celebrated Hilarion, the establisher of monasticism in Palestine. He had himself afterwards founded the monastery of Ad, over which he presided when he was called to the important see of Salamis, in Cyprus. It was principally in that maritime and commercial city that he acquired an early celebrity by his preaching and his writings, as well as by the soundness of his doctrine and the purity of his life. He lived to a great age. It is even said that at the time of his death, in 402, he was considerably more than a hundred years old. Born

[1] Cave, tom. i., p. 232.

in the third century, he died in the fifth, after having been thirty-six years a bishop. We find him acting an eminent part at Rome and at Constantinople, combating with great firmness various evil tendencies of his age, and especially the Arian heresy, as well as the use of images, which was then beginning to appear, and the too-much-accredited errors of Origen. Hence arose his dispute with John of Jerusalem, and even with the illustrious Chrysostom, whom he reproached for not having condemned them in a manner sufficiently clear and distinct. Epiphanius has been accused of laying too much stress on tradition.

69. His words on the canon are these:—

"Hadst thou been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and taught by the prophets and apostles, thou wouldst, in proceeding from the creation to the time of Esther, read the twenty-seven books of the Old Testament, (the Hebrews reckon only twenty-two,) and the four holy Gospels, and the fourteen epistles of the holy apostle Paul, with the Acts of the Apostles, (Acts written previously or during the same period,) and also the Catholic Epistles of James, Peter, John, Jude, and the Apocalypse of John, besides the two books of Wisdom, that of Solomon, and that of the Son of Sirach, and, in a word, (ἁπλῶς,) all the sacred scriptures."

70. Such is the exact and complete catalogue of Epiphanius, as to the New Testament. We do not, for the present, say anything of the Old Testament, as we wish to avoid adding any unnecessary complication to our task. Otherwise, we would have pointed out the error of Epiphanius, who recommends two uncanonical books, "The Wisdom of Sirach," (*Ecclesiasticus*,) and "The Wisdom of Solomon." In his time they formed a distinct class, (as we shall by and by shew, in examining the catalogue of *Rufinus*,) and were called *Ecclesiastical*. As distinguished from *apocryphal* writings, they were allowed to be publicly read. "Besides the twenty-seven given by God to the Jews, (ἐκ Θεοῦ δοθεῖσαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις,) and by them reckoned twenty-two," says Epiphanius, at the beginning of the same work, "there are, independently of the apocryphal writings, two books which are controverted among them, (παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῳ,) the Wisdom of Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon." "These two books are unquestionably useful and edifying," he adds in another place; "but they are not

placed among the acknowledged books, and that is the reason why they have not bee admitted into the ark of the covenant, (*Ἀλλ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ῥητῶν οὐκ ἀναφέρονται, διὸ οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ τῆς διαθήκης κιβωτῷ ἀνετέθησαν.*)"

71. Jerome.—The fourth catalogue is that of *Jerome*. Of all the fathers of the fourth century this illustrious doctor is unquestionably the most worthy to be heard on the canon of Scripture; not, indeed, for his character, or his meekness, or candour, or spiritual knowledge of the gospel, or even for his respect for the sacred books,—his language on this point being often unseemly; but for his unvaried perspicuity, his acquaintance with the sacred tongues, his erudition, his travels, his immense application, and his long residence in Palestine, where his researches in connexion with the Scriptures were unceasing.

This celebrated man, who, by his life, belongs equally to the West and to the East, was raised up by God to spread a great light in the Church, by urging the study of the sacred texts, and bringing back general attention, especially among the Latins and Greeks, to the pure sources of Biblical truth. His career, moreover, was, like that of Epiphanius, of great length, as he died in 420 at the age of eighty-nine. Born in Upper Dalmatia, he repaired to Rome for the purpose of continuing his studies under the eloquent *Victorinus*, the African. Entering on his first course of travels, he traversed Gaul, visiting all the libraries, proceeding as far as Trèves to meet with *Hilarius*, and returning by Aquileia to Venice to see *Rufinus*. From that he went to Thrace, and, passing over into Asia, proceeded as far as Antioch, for the purpose of passing four years in the solitude of the desert, and devoting himself entirely to the study of oriental languages and the Holy Scriptures. It was only at the age of forty-nine that he was ordained a presbyter. Already, however, famous all over the empire, he repaired to Constantinople a short time before the second general council, which was held there in 381. In that capital he attended, with great ardour, the lectures of Gregory of Nazianzus, till he left it in company with Epiphanius and Paulinus for Rome, where he spent three years, and where Bishop Damasus appointed him one of his private secretaries. Thoroughly disgusted, however, with that city, after the death of Damasus, he left it in 385,

never to return. He visited Epiphanius in Cyprus; thence passed over to Jerusalem, and, the following year, went to Egypt, where he became a hearer of the illustrious *Didymus*. Returning at length to Palestine, he entered on his long and last retirement in the plain of Bethlehem. It was there, during the space of thirty-three years, that he wrote the greatest part of his works; and that, constantly visited by the most illustrious individuals, he became the oracle of his age.

72. Jerome has given us his catalogue under more than one form; and it may be stated, before we proceed further, that the first volume of his works is itself a catalogue. It has been called *Divina Hieronymi Bibliotheca*, as it contains all the books of Holy Scripture, translated by Jerome from Hebrew or Greek, with prefaces of great value prefixed. It is divided into three parts. The first comprehends the Hebrew canon, or the *Pentateuch*, the *Prophets*, and the *Hagiographa*. The second contains some books of the Old Testament, which Jerome had translated either from the Chaldaic or from the Greek of the Septuagint. The third contains all the books of the New Testament, with prefaces and copious notes. In his preface to the seven epistles, which is addressed to Eustochius, the author informs us that, having found, in the Latin manuscripts, the Epistle of Peter misplaced, and put at the head of the rest, (from a mistaken zeal for the primacy of that apostle,) he had been at pains to restore it to its proper place, "in conformity," he says, "to the order always observed in the Greek manuscripts." He informs us, at the same time, that unfaithful translators had omitted the passage relating to the three witnesses in the First Epistle of John. Some have pretended to deny that the preface in question was written by Jerome, but we cannot enter on this point here.

73. Besides this, Jerome has given us his catalogue directly, and more than once; first in his treatise *De Viris Illustribus*,[1] written in 392, and afterwards in his *Epistle to Paulinus*,[2] written in 397.

In that letter he says:—

[1] Chap. v.; Opera, tom. iv.
[2] Tom. iv., p. 574. Edit. Bened. (Martianay), Paris, 1693.

"I shall just briefly refer to the New Testament. It contains first Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, *the four-horsed chariot of the Lord, the true cherubims,* (then follows a mystic explanation of the chariots of Ezekiel.) Then Paul writes to seven churches, for his eighth epistle, that to the Hebrews, is, by the Latins, usually arranged separately, (*a plerisque extra numerum ponitur.*) He writes to Timothy and to Titus; he recommends to Philemon a fugitive slave. . . . . The Acts of the Apostles seem to describe the infancy of the Christian Church; but on learning that the writer of that book is Luke the physician, 'whose praise is in the gospel,' (2 Cor. viii. 18,) we are satisfied that all its words are a remedy for a diseased soul. The apostles James, Peter, John, and Jude, have published seven epistles, as mystic as condensed, and at once both short and long—short as to the words, long as to the sense. . . . . The Revelation of John contains as many mysteries as words, (*tot habet sacramenta quot verba.*) What I say of it is little in comparison to the merit of the book." He adds, "*In verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiæ.*"

74. We see, then, that Jerome, like the rest, received the seven epistles *controverted* and *uncontroverted.* He considered all the four writers *apostles;* he extols the Revelation, and specifies the fourteen epistles of Paul, saying, merely in reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "the Latins for the most part exclude it." He is very far from saying that he himself excludes it, for he is at pains to repeat, in various parts of his writings, that he regards it as canonical, and believes it to be Paul's.

He wrote to *Dardanus,* about the year 414, as follows:—"Our friends (the Latins) must be made to understand that the Epistle to the Hebrews is received as Paul's, not only by the churches of the East, but likewise by all the earlier Greek ecclesiastical authors, (*ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus,*) though most people there believe it to have been written by Barnabas or Clement. It must also be remarked that it is really of small importance whether Paul or some other planter of the churches wrote it, since its Divine authority is daily recognised, by the fact of its being publicly read in the churches, (*et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebratur.*) If usage among the Latins has not admitted it to a place among the canonical Scriptures, and if,

on the other hand, the churches of the Greeks do not receive so freely (as the Latins) the Revelation of John, we recognise both, (*tamen nos utrumque suscipimus,*) as we desire to follow, not the usage of the present time, but the authority of ancient authors."

75. *Rufinus.*—The fifth catalogue is that of Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia.

Long on terms of friendship with Jerome, he was his fellow-student in the schools of Aquileia, travelled, like him, in the East, (about the year 371,) visited, like him, Egypt, attached himself, like him, to *Didymus,* established, like him, a monastery in Palestine, where he spent twenty-five years; but, having engaged in a controversy with Epiphanius, from zeal for the memory and doctrine of Origen, he drew upon himself the enmity of Jerome, and returned to Italy in 397, to die in Sicily in 410."

His catalogue, which is to be found in his Exposition of the Apostles' Creed,[1] is so remarkable for the clearness and precision of its language, that we shall translate the greater part of it:—

"It was the Holy Spirit," says he, "that, in the Old Testament, inspired the *Law* and the *Prophets,* and in the New Testament, the *Gospels* and the *Apostles.* Therefore the apostle has said, '*All scripture is given by inspiration, and is useful for instruction.*' That is the reason why it appears to me proper to specify here, by a distinct enumeration, (*evidente numero,*) from the records of the fathers, the books both of the Old Testament and of the New, which, according to the testimony of the ancients, are held as inspired by the Holy Spirit, and transmitted to the churches of Christ.

"In the New Testament are the four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke; fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul; two of the Apostle Peter; one of James the Apostle, and the Lord's brother; one of Jude; three of John, and John's Apocalypse. Such are the books which the fathers have included in the Canon, and on which they have desired that the assertions of our faith should be founded, (*ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt.*)

"It is necessary, however, to point out, at the same time, that

[1] In the works of Cyprian, p. 26. Amsterdam edition, 1691.

there are, besides these, other books that were called by the ancients (*a majoribus*) not *canonical*, but *ecclesiastical*. Such are the *Wisdom of Solomon*, and the *Wisdom* of the Son of *Sirach*, ... the book of *Tobit*, that of *Judith*, and the books of the *Maccabees*.

"In connexion with the New Testament, there is the short book called, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, (or likewise, *The Two Voices*, or, *The Judgment of Peter*.) All these books, it is true, were allowed to be *read* in churches, but they could not be quoted for establishing points of faith, (*non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam*.) The other books professing to be scriptures are called *apocryphal*, and are not allowed to be read in churches.

"I have thought proper," adds Rufinus, "to mention these circumstances here, which we know from the fathers, for the information of such as are learning the elements of the faith, that they may all understand at what fountain of the Word of God they may fill their cups."

We have here, then, a clear statement of the distinction, which we have mentioned in speaking of Athanasius and Epiphanius, of three sorts of books—*canonical*, twenty-seven in number and divinely-inspired; *ecclesiastical*, to be read in churches solely for edification; and *apocryphal*, forbidden to be read at all.

76. Augustin.—The sixth and last catalogue of the fathers of the fourth century, entirely the same as our canon, is that of the most sublime and the most profound of the ancient doctors, the illustrious bishop of Hippo. He is the latest of the fathers that we intend to quote in the present inquiry. About a hundred years later than *Eusebius*, he belongs to the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth; as Eusebius belonged to the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth.

Born in Numidia, of Christian parents, in 355, though, in spite of his mother's tears, early drawn into the fatal doctrines and practices of the Manichæans, he was a public professor of rhetoric at Carthage, when, at the age of twenty-eight, he left Africa and repaired first to Rome, and afterwards to Milan. It was in this latter city that, through his intercourse with the illustrious *Ambrose*, who had received him with great kindness, he was convinced of his errors; but it was only in 388, when he had reached the

age of thirty-three, that he was converted from darkness to light, by a manifest display of Divine power. Returning the following year to Africa, he resided for three years in retirement on his father's estate, and was then ordained to the holy ministry at the age of thirty-six. Five years afterwards he was called to the episcopal see of Hippo. He died in 430 at the age of seventy-five, while shut up in the city of Hippo, which the Vandals, already masters of Africa, were then besieging by sea and land. This admirable man, who, during his long career, had never ceased to labour, by his powerful writings, for the defence of the doctrines of grace, and the consolidation of the churches of God all over the world, was raised up not only to overthrow, during his own age, the Pelagian heresy, but to cast a beneficent track of light over the Church through all succeeding ages. His works have been published in eleven folio volumes.[1] His "City of God," his commentaries on the Psalms, his sermons, his letters, his recantations, his confessions, his treatises on sin and grace, commend themselves to the Christian reader by two main characteristics—the devotional feeling they everywhere breathe, and his argumentative method, which should serve at all times as a pattern to divines, from its being a perpetual exposition of the Word of God through the Word of God itself. He was a pillar in the house of God, and he remains a luminary to all ages.

77. We copy his catalogue as contained in one of the latest of his works, entitled, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*,[2] begun in 397 and completed in 426.[3]

For the present we omit what he says regarding the Old Testament, adducing here his testimony merely as to the New:—

"The authoritative books of the New Testament are, (*Hisce libris Testamenti Novi terminatur auctoritas,*)—*Quatuor libris Evangelii, (secundum Matthæum, Marcum, Lucam, Joannem;) quatuordecim Epistolis Pauli apostoli, (ad Rom., ad Cor. duabus,*

[1] The best edition, the Benedictine, (Paris, 1679, and following years,) has been reprinted at Antwerp, 1700–1703, and at Paris, in royal octavo, 1835–1840.

[2] Lib. ii., vol. iii., part i., sec. 13, p. 47. Edit. Paris. 1836.

[3] Cave, Hist. Lit., vol. i., p. 290, &c.

ad Gal., ad Eph., ad Thess. duabus, ad Col., ad Tim. duabus, ad Titum, ad Philemonem, ad Hebræos;) Petri duabus; tribus Joannis; unâ Judæ, et unâ Jacobi; Actibus Apostolorum, libro uno; et Apocalypsi Joannis, libro uno."

CHAPTER XI.

SOME OTHER CATALOGUES, ALLEGED TO BE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY, AND AGREEING WITH OUR CANON, ARE APOCRYPHAL OR SPURIOUS.

78. BESIDES these nine catalogues of the fathers of the fourth century, three others are quoted. We have not given an account of these; because they do not possess a sufficient claim to our confidence, one being doubtful and the others forged.

In the same way, in Chapter VI., when treating of the second century, we have not mentioned the apocryphal book of *Apostolic Canons*,[1] which pretends to give, in the name of the apostles, "to all the clergy and laity (πᾶσι κληρικοῖς καὶ λαϊκοῖς) a list of the secret and holy books (σεβάσμια καὶ ἅγια) of the Old and the New Testament," and which specifies the fourteen epistles of Paul and the *seven* other *apostolic epistles*. In the present chapter, in which we treat of the fourth century, we refrain from mentioning the three catalogues respectively attributed to Pope *Innocent* I., to Pope *Damasus*, and to *Amphilochius*, as we regard the last as doubtful and the two others as spurious.

The same remark applies also to the catalogue pretended to be of the fifth century, and ascribed to Pope *Gelasius*, but of which not the slightest mention occurs in historical documents previous to the time of *Isidorus Mercator*, in the ninth century.

SECTION I.

CATALOGUE OF INNOCENT I.

79. Pope *Innocent* I. (bishop of Rome in 402) is represented

[1] In number 85. Athanasius (Festal Epist. xxxix.) called the collection ἡ διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων. The book, at first small, was gradually enlarged. See Patres. Apost. Cotelerii, i., pp. 453, 485, edit. Amst.

as having published, towards the end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century, *a list of the books contained in the Canon of Scripture.* This pretended list entirely agrees, as to the New Testament, with that of our churches; but, as to the Old, it was drawn up for the purpose of sanctioning the Apocrypha.

It is to be found in the pretended *Epistle to Exuperus*,[1] bishop of Toulouse. That epistle, however, says William Cave,[2] ought, for the following reasons, to be regarded as entirely spurious— 1. The barbarism of its style, incompatible with the supposition of its being a production of the age of Innocent I. 2. The absurd adaptations it contains of Holy Scripture. 3. Its doctrinal errors, which were unquestionably unknown till a later period. 4. Very gross historical anachronisms. 5. Its mention of rites which had not yet been introduced into the Christian Church. Besides, the falsity of this pretended document is sufficiently proved by the fact that the Council of Carthage, entertaining some doubts in relation to the canon, resolved to consult Pope Boniface on the subject, who was raised to the Papal chair only sixteen years after Innocent I. This obviously implies that Innocent had not settled the canon. Moreover, as Bishop *Cosin* remarks, no mention was ever made of the epistle in question for three hundred years from the death of Innocent; and it was never stated that this epistle contained a catalogue of inspired books till a hundred years after its appearance!

80. The ancient Church was long governed by what was called "The Universal Code of Canons;" a code which was afterwards ratified by the Emperor *Justinian.* It consisted of two hundred and seven canons, enacted by four general councils and five provincial. The canons were arranged in a precise order, that their number might neither be increased nor diminished. This continued to be the case till the time of *Dionysius the Younger*, abbot of Rome, who died in 540. Dionysius undertook to translate the code from Greek into Latin, but had the hardihood to introduce numerous alterations, all in favour of the Papacy. He omitted, for example, the eight canons of the Council of Ephesus, a large portion of the last canon of Laodicea, the last three canons

[1] Third edit., Paris, 1671; vol. ii., p. 1256.
[2] Hist. Lit., i., p. 379.

of Constantinople, the last two of Chalcedon, and he added a great number of canons unknown to the Christian Church. Yet, let us remark that, with all these alterations, there appeared no decretal epistle of a pope; so that, for a hundred years, even the *Roman Code* contained no trace of an *Epistle of Innocent.* It was not till 200 years after *Dionysius the Little,* and 300 after *Innocent,* that an abridgement of the Canons, (*Breviarum Canonum,*) drawn up in 689 by *Cresconius,* an African bishop, added to the Code of *Dionysius the Little* the decretal epistles of six popes, and among these an *Epistle to Exuperus.* Even then this pretended *Epistle of Innocent* did not as yet contain his pretended catalogue. It was not till a hundred years after *Cresconius,* or 400 years after Innocent I., that Isidorus Mercator, in the year 800, published his *Collection of Decretals,*—"such a collection," says Cosin, "as no honest man could bring himself to use; and it remained without effect till Pope Leo IV. (in 850) and Pope Nicholas, (in 860,) perceiving the advantage they might derive from these false decretals, promulgated them as law."

We enter into these details here merely to avoid the necessity of recurring to them when we shall have occasion subsequently to speak of the *False Decretals,* and the pernicious use which was made of them in the Apocrypha question.

Section II.

CATALOGUE OF DAMASUS.

81. For the same reasons as the preceding we refrain from mentioning, in connexion with the fourth century, the pretended catalogue of *Damasus,*[1] contained in a decree (*De Explanatione Fidei*) said to have been passed under that Pope in a council at Rome, between 366 and 384. That catalogue, agreeing, as to the New Testament, with that of our churches, is introduced in these terms:—"*Nunc vero de Scripturis Divinis agendum est, quid universalis Catholica Ecclesia teneat et quid vitari debeat.*" We regard it as spurious, like that of Innocent, as it is now well ascertained that all the decretals professing to be anterior to Pope

[1] See Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, iv., pp. 187-196.

Syricus (from 384 to 398) are to be classed among the *False Decretals*, which no one, even in the Roman camp, any longer dares to uphold.

SECTION III.

CATALOGUE OF AMPHILOCHIUS.[1]

82. Lastly, as to the catalogue in Greek verse, usually published among the works of Gregory the Divine, (under the title of *Iambi ad Seleucum*,) and often ascribed to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium about the year 380, and of which we have already spoken, (Thesis 61,) we regard it as, at least, apocryphal, if not spurious. Neither its date, nor its author, nor its history, is accurately known. It abounds in metrical faults, and there is no sufficient reason for believing that *Amphilochius* was its author. We possess no authentic work of that bishop so as to be able to institute a comparison. Many have even been inclined to ascribe it to *Gregory of Nazianzus*, as if these Iambics presented to us a second and a poetic expression of his mind on the canon. Whatever is to be concluded regarding the author and origin of this apocryphal catalogue, it comprehends in the *true canon of the inspired Scriptures* all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament; but adds that some *erroneously* (*οὐκ εὖ λέγοντας*) reject the Epistle to the Hebrews, while others do not receive the brief epistles of John and Jude, and that a still greater number of persons do not receive the Apocalypse. After having specified all our twenty-seven books, and only these, the writer concludes thus:—

Οὗτος ἀψευδέστος
Κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων Γραφῶν.

"Let such be held as the true canon of inspired Scriptures."

[1] This is the Amphilochius who, in order to obtain from Theodosius the long-refused decree against the Arians, presented himself one day before the emperor without offering any homage to his son, Arcadius, who sate on a throne beside him. "You are displeased at my irreverence, and with reason. But what must the eternal Father, the King of kings, think of those who refuse to honour His only Son, and who blaspheme His holy name?"—*Sozomen*, bk. vii., chap. ix.

CHAPTER XII.

THE TWO CATALOGUES, DRAWN UP BY COUNCILS, OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

NATURE OF THEIR TESTIMONY.

83. WHAT we have now heard from the mouth of all the Fathers of the fourth century, who have bequeathed to us their definitions of Holy Scripture, is in strict accordance with the statements of councils of the same century, that formally inquired into the number of the sacred books, and left us a catalogue of them.

Only two councils, during the fourth century, have given expression to the mind of their times on the canon. These are the Council of Laodicea and that of Carthage. The former was held in Asia Minor, on the banks of the Lycus, in the province of Phrygia, in the year 364, thirty-nine years after the General Council of Nice; the latter, in Africa, thirty-three years later, presided over by Bishop *Aurelius*, who was aided, it is said, by the celebrated *Augustin*, bishop of Hippo, in the year 397.

84. We have hitherto seen, from all the catalogues of this century, what striking unanimity the Fathers, from the date of the Council of Nice—though on this point no shadow of constraint was ever exerted—spontaneously came to an agreement on the sacred canon of the New Testament, with the sole exception, on the part of a few, of the Revelation of John. This agreement was unshaken, as it had always been, as to the twenty books of the first canon; it was henceforth universal in reference to the five *antilegomena* of Eusebius, or the second canon, and it was no less complete as to the Epistle to the Hebrews. There was no longer any hesitation, real or apparent, except in reference to the Apocalypse. We say *real or apparent*, because two circumstances

very different from each other may, according to the case, alternately account for this diversity. On the one hand, among some, the dispute with the millenarians was still too recent, and the controversy had been too keen, in the East especially, to admit the entire removal of prejudice against that book, which was regarded as the great prop of their views. On the other, even in many of the Churches most distinctly upholding the divine canonicity of the Apocalypse, that book appeared too mysterious to be read in public religious meetings. Though, however, these two circumstances still contributed more or less to preserve some discordance in the language of the Churches in reference to the Apocalypse, even that discordance had ceased, and all the Churches, on this and on every other point, had come to an entire agreement, and were henceforth to utter but one and the same sound all over the earth. This will now be attested by the Councils of Laodicea and of Carthage, that are going to express themselves as the Fathers have done.

85. It will, however, be proper, before hearing them, to point out the exact object they had in view. That object was, on this point, evidently the maintenance of the discipline and not of the doctrine of the Church. They expressly speak to record testimony, and not to establish authoritatively an article of faith. Neither of these councils professes to decide which books shall be held in the Church, henceforth, of Divine authority, and which shall not. Their intention was simply to regulate the public reading in their religious meetings, and, with this view, to declare the mind of contemporaneous churches, and the testimonies of antiquity, regarding the canonical books, and the books allowed to be read in public. "For," says the Council of Carthage, "we know from the Fathers that these are the books which should be read in the church, (*quia a patribus ista accepimus in ecclesia legenda*). It will thus be seen that there is nothing in their language resembling the haughty tone of the Council of Trent, deciding for the universal Church, as God might do, the canonicity of such and such a book, and pronouncing an *anathema* (*post jactum fidei confessionis fundamentum*)[1] against all who dare

[1] Words of the Council of Trent, (Sess. iv.,) April 8, 1546. Labbé, Concilia, tom. xiv., p. 746.

to differ in opinion on this point, (*Si quis libros* [*istos*] *pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, . . . anathema sit.*) The decree of the Council of Carthage, as well as that of Laodicea, proves that the councils did not mean to *enact* what books should be recognised as Divine, but to *declare* what books were already held as Divine in the Church of God, according to tradition and history, and, therefore, should be *publicly read* in the religious assemblies of Asia Minor and of Africa Zeugitana.

"Neither private psalms (*ἰδιωτικοὺς*, that is, composed by private individuals) nor uncanonical books, (*ἀκανόνιστα,*)" says the Council of Laodicea, "shall be *recited* (*λέγεσθαι*) in church, but only the canonical books of the New Testament and of the Old. Here are the books *to be read*, (*ἀναγινώσκεσθαι.*)"[1]

"It has been deemed by us proper," says that of Carthage, "that, besides the canonical Scriptures, nothing should be read in church under the name of sacred Scriptures (*nihil in ecclesia* legatur *sub nomine Divinarum Scripturarum*) except, perhaps, it may be allowable to read in it acts of the martyrs, or the anniversaries of their death."[2]

86. The catalogue of Laodicea and that of Carthage have each two peculiarities:—

In regard to the Old Testament, the Council of Laodicea entirely excludes the apocryphal books, and does not mention the Apocalypse as part of the New; while, in all other respects, it is identical with the canon of our Churches.

On the contrary, the Council of Carthage admits the apocryphal books as part of the Old Testament, and mentions the Apocalypse as part of the New; so that, as to the New Testament, it is identical with the canon of our Churches.

These two orders of facts, when rightly understood, are quite reconcilable, as we shall shew by and by. They are opposed to each other only in appearance.

Section II.

THE COUNCIL OF LAODICEA.

87. The Council of Laodicea was convoked to represent the

[1] Cave, Hist. Litt., p. 362. [2] Mansi, iii., p. 891.

churches throughout the different regions of Asia Minor, and promote the revival of ecclesiastical discipline. Thirty-two bishops assembled at Laodicea, under the moderatorship of their metropolitan, *Nunechius*, in 364. This date is furnished by the "*Code of the Canons of the Universal Church*," which had early admitted the canons of Laodicea, and which was the law of the Church till the sixteenth century. The Council of Laodicea, which was much larger than a provincial synod, as it contained deputies from the whole of Asia Minor, was, from its commencement, an object of respect throughout the Christian Church, and its decisions were regarded at once, both among the Greeks[1] and the Latins, as forming a part of the "Ecclesiastical Regulations" binding on all bishops. This is evident from the epistle which Pope Leo IV. addressed, about the year 850, to the clergy of Great Britain.[2] In fact, it was not only by the sixth Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople,[3] that the canons of Laodicea were admitted into the "Code of the Universal Church," but, previously, by the fourth Ecumenical Council, held at *Chalcedon* in 451, and by a decree of the Emperor *Justinian* in 536;[4] so that, all over the Church, they had the same authority as the canons of General Councils and the imperial laws that ratified them.

On these facts the clear and conclusive writings of *Justel*[5] and *Le Chassier*[6] may be consulted, as well as the learned expositions of Bishop *Cosin* in his work on the canon.[7]

88. Yet, how great soever may have been the veneration of the ancient Church for the Council of Laodicea, it was to be expected that the Roman doctors would try to destroy its authority,[8] as it absolutely excludes from *the canonical books* the Old Testament

[1] "Hoc concilium, antiqua nobilitate celeberrimum," says Binnius, "Græcorum atque Latinorum scriptis celebri memoriæ commendatum fecit," (Ex Baronio not 1, in Laod. Cons.)

[2] Canon de Libellis, Dist. 20.

[3] Quini Sexta Synodus in Trullo, (692,) whose canons have met with some objections.

[4] Novel. 131.

[5] Præfat. in Cod. Eccl. Univers. Testimonia præfixa ante cod. Dionysii Exigu.

[6] Opusc. in consult. de controv. inter Papam Paulum V. et Remp. Venet.

[7] Art. lix.–lxiii.

[8] It is marked as doubtful in many editions of the Councils, for example, in Harduin, (I. 79.)

apocrypha, admited into the canon 1200 years later by the Council of Trent. The arguments of the Romanists on this point have been very powerfully combated by Bishop *Cosin*:—

1. "*Dionysius the Little*," say the Romanists, "has omitted the catalogue in his translation of the 'Universal Code of Canons.'"

But Dionysius the Little is known to have made many other alterations and omissions.

2. Neither does the *Roman code*, they add, contain it.

But it is to the Greeks rather than to the Latins, to the *Universal Code*, rather than to the *Roman Code*, that we must appeal. The latter omits, in like manner, eight canons of the Council of Ephesus, the last three of the Council of Constantinople, and the last two of the Council of Chalcedon.

Besides, says Cosin, the fraud betrays it through a singular oversight. In discarding from the 59th canon of Laodicea the catalogue of canonical Scriptures, its *preface* and *title* have been inadvertently retained, and these make a manifest allusion to the books enumerated further on in all other editions of the Council. Those published by *Mercator*, *Merlin*, *Crab*, *Surius*, *du Tillier*, *Binnius*, as well as those published by *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, all contain the catalogue omitted in the *Roman Code*.[1]

3. *Catharin*, to evade the testimony of the decree of Laodicea, has recourse, on the contrary, to the supposition that the catalogue was originally more extended, and that the apocryphal books had been subsequently omitted. "*Vehementer suspicor*," says he; "I strongly suspect."

But by such gratuitous conjectures anything could be established and anything overturned.

4. Lastly, *Baronius*, in his "Annales," goes still further. He represents the Council of Laodicea as earlier than that of Nice, and makes the latter pass a decree regarding the Apocrypha.[2] He thus expected to upset the authority of the former by that of the latter, as a General Council can modify the decisions of a Provincial.

But, in the first place, we have already shewn (Theses 52 and 53) that the supposition of a Nicean decree about the book of *Judith* is without foundation.

[1] Codex Canonum et Decretorum Ecclesiæ Romanæ, p. 502.

[2] We do not add a translation, as the substance has been given in Thesis 87.

In the second place, the *Code of the Universal Church*, in reproducing the canons of Laodicea, specifies 364 as the date of the Council.

In the third place, all ancient collections, either Greek or Latin, of the *Synodical Canons* have always placed those of Laodicea *after* those of Antioch, and we know that the Council of Antioch was held sixteen years after that of Nice.

Lastly, the *Photinians* are condemned in the 7th canon of Laodicea. Now, these were first mentioned in 345, that is, twenty years after the Council of Nice.

89. The reader will probably feel an interest in reading the entire decree of Laodicea in the original:—

CANONS LIX. AND LX.[1]

Οτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐδὲ ἀπαύστατα βιβλιά, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.

Ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. ἀ. Γένεσις κόσμου, β'. Ἔξοδος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, γ'. Λευϊτικόν, δ'. Ἀριθμοί, ε'. Δευτερονόμιον, ϛ'. Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ, ζ'. Κριταί. Ῥούθ, ἡ. Ἐσθήρ, θ'. Βασιλειῶν πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα, ι'. Τρίτη καὶ τετάρτη, ια'. Παραλειπόμενα πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ιβ'. Ἔσδρας πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ιγ'. Βίβλος ψαλμῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα, ιδ'. Παροιμίαι Σαλομῶντος, ιε'. Ἐκκλησιαστής, ις'. Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, ιζ'. Ἰὼβ, ιη'. Δώδεκα προφῆται, ιθ'. Ἡσαΐας, κ'. Ἱερεμιάς καὶ Βαρούχ.[2] Θρῆνοι καὶ ἐπιστολαί, κα'. Ἰεζεκιήλ, κβ'. Δανιήλ.

Τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ταῦτα· Εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα, κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην· Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων, Ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαὶ ἑπτά, οὕτως· Ἰακώβου μία, Πέτρου δύο, Ἰωάννου τρεῖς, Ἰούδα μία. Ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου δεκατέσσαρες· πρὸς Ῥωμαίους μία, πρὸς Κορινθίους δύο, πρὸς Γαλάτας μία, πρὸς Ἐφεσίους μία, πρὸς Φιλιππησίους μία, πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς μία, πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δύο, πρὸς Ἑβραίους μία, πρὸς Τιμόθεον δύο, πρὸς Τίτον μία, πρὸς Φιλήμονα μία.

---

[1] These are the two last of the canons; but they are numbered 163 and 164 in the *Universal Code*, which contains 207, anterior to the time of Dionysius the Little.

[2] This is no specifying of the apocryphal book of Baruch, but simply an exegetical mode of pointing out more distinctly what, according to the Jews, their twentieth book contained, which we are accustomed to call "*Jeremiah and his Lamentations*." It was nearly in the same manner that Origen, a hundred years before, had distinguished in detail the same book of Jeremiah, (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., lib. vi., cap. 25;) "*Jeremiah*," said he, "*with his Lamentations and his Epistle* (chap. 30) forms only one book." Athanasius, also, and Cyril, in designating the book of Jeremiah, add, as the Council of Laodicea does, an indication of the contents of chapter 29th, and of what is to be found in Jeremiah about Baruch. (See chapters 32, 36, 43, and 45.) Besides, the meaning of the council's expression became clear from the number *of twenty-two books*, which it carefully retains.

90. It may be asked why the assembled bishops in this council made no mention of the Apocalypse. Had it not been for their silence on this single book, their catalogue would have been perfect.

Many will undoubtedly attribute this silence to the supposed circumstance of the Apocalypse not having been yet restored to the canon of sacred books. This explanation, however, we think absolutely incompatible with contemporary facts; and it appears to us much more likely that the Fathers of Laodicea, while they admitted the canonicity of that sacred book, considered it too symbolical and too mysterious to be read with propriety in public religious meetings.

In fact, we must not lose sight of the object these fathers had in view. Their attention was confined to the public reading of the Scriptures in church, and their declaration referred merely to two points. First, they prohibited the reading of what was not *canonical scripture*, and, secondly, they decreed that the twenty-two books of the Old Testament and twenty-six books of the New, *should be read*. But they did not say that the twenty-seventh book, though they did not mention it, was regarded by them as uncanonical. In like manner, the Church of England at the present day ranks the Apocalypse among the canonical books, (Prayer-book, and sixth of her Thirty-nine Articles,) while, on the other hand, in the Calendar, and in the preface to the Prayer-book, she excludes the Apocalypse from the public lessons.

If the bishops, instead of enacting a mere rule of discipline relating to the lessons of the Church, had professed to exclude the Apocalypse from the canon, the proceeding would have everywhere awakened an outcry, the echoes of which would have reached our own times. The council could not have conceived the idea of setting at nought the striking testimony rendered to the Apocalypse by the most ancient martyrs and the most venerable fathers. The assembly could not have solemnly given the lie to the Justin Martyrs, the Irenæuses, the Methodiuses, the Hippolytuses, the Melitos, the Clements of Alexandria, the Theophiluses of Antioch, the Origens, the Tertullians, without calling forth all over the Church an outburst of amazement and disapprobation.

Tertullian, in denouncing "heresies," had specified as one of them the rejection of the Apocalypse.[1]

On the contrary, not one of the illustrious admirers of the Apocalypse, during that period, was heard to complain. Yet many such flourished at the very time of the council, and the fame of their writings filled the whole Christian world. Athanasius was still alive. So were Epiphanius, Basil the Great, Ephrem, all equally attached to the canonicity of that book.[2] Jerome and Rufinus were still in the prime of life.[3] Not only, however, was none of these eminent men heard to complain of the decision so contrary to their convictions, but none of the writers opposed to restoring the Apocalypse to the canon ever appealed to the authority of the decision of Laodicea as giving countenance to his views.

Besides, when, thirty-three years later, the Council of Carthage passed the decree in which the Apocalypse is specified, no one regarded it as at variance with the decision of the Council of Laodicea, which all the Churches, both of the East and of the West, held in so great respect. It must unquestionably have been that the difference between the two councils was considered merely a matter of discipline regarding the lessons for the Lord's-day, and the order of public worship—points on which one Church was at liberty to differ from another.

Lastly, there is another authentic fact which clearly proves that the two councils were regarded as entirely agreed on all matters of faith, and differing only in points of order and discipline, in which orthodox congregations were at perfect liberty to differ from each other. The fact to which we allude is what was done, at the end of the seventh century, at the sixth *General Council*, held at Constantinople.[4] That great assembly, consisting of 227 bishops, solemnly ratified, by its second canon, the acts of the Council of Laodicea, as well as the epistles of Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Amphilochius, (which excludes from the list of Holy Scriptures, as is well known, the Apocrypha,) and, at the same

[1] Against Marcion, book iv.

[2] They died respectively twelve, fifteen, and thirty-eight years afterwards.

[3] In the thirty-third year of their age.

[4] Quini-Sextum, *in Trullo*, 692.

time, ratified also the acts of the *Council of Carthage*. This fact appears to us decisive. It was impossible it could ratify the acts of both councils, had it not regarded the act of the Council of Carthage, relating to the books to be read in church, as a measure entirely compatible with the decree of the Council of Laodicea on the same subject. It follows, as we have said, that both decrees were clearly regarded as relating merely to a matter of discipline.

SECTION III.

THE COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE.

91. All accounts of the Council of Carthage agree as to its having been held at the beginning of September 397, ("*Caesario et Attico consulibus.*") It decreed, however, by its forty-seventh canon, "*that the bishops should consult, on the tenor of their decisions, the Church beyond sea, as well as their brethren and colleagues, Boniface, or other bishops of the same regions.*"

Now, this *Boniface*, the forty-third bishop of Rome, did not enter on his office till *one-and-twenty years* after the date of this decree. Either, therefore, this mention of the Pope must be one of those later interpolations with which the champions of Rome have disfigured nearly all their records of ecclesiastical antiquity, or the whole forty-seventh canon is a forgery, or (what appears still more probable) the forty-nine canons ascribed to the council belonged to it only in part, and, among others, the forty-seventh was enacted by some other African synod, held during the fifth century, and was afterwards inserted among the acts of Carthage by some blundering compiler, who had arranged them all according to his fancy, without any regard to their dates.

This explanation is confirmed by another act of the same council. Canon forty-eighth decrees that the members of the council should consult their brethren, *Siricius* and *Simplicianus*, bishops, the one of Rome, and the other of Milan. But between this *Siricius*, to be consulted according to the forty-eighth canon, and *Boniface*, to be consulted according to the forty-seventh, there intervened no fewer than three popes, the first having died in 398, a year after the holding of the council, and the second having only entered on his office twenty years later, that is, in 418.

92. This forty-seventh canon, however, whatever may be its real date, presents to us a record of the universal mind of the churches of the period. In fact, it not only gives us the same list of sacred books as that now received by all the churches in the world, but enumerates them as far as the twenty-seventh in the order of our modern Bibles.

As given in the edition of the Councils by Labbé and Cossart, (vol. ii., p. 1177,[1]) the list is as follows:—

"Canon 47. The council has decided that, *besides the canonical Scriptures*, nothing shall be read in church under the name of Sacred Scriptures, (Item placuit ut, præter *Scripturas canonicas*, nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine *Divinarum Scripturarum*.)

'The *canonical Scriptures* of the Old Testament are these: . . . . . .

"The canonical books of the New Testament are:—The Gospels, four books; the Acts of the Apostles, one book; thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul; one epistle of the same apostle to the Hebrews; two epistles of the apostle Peter; three of the apostle John; one of the apostle Jude; one of James; and one book of the Revelation of John, (*Novi autem Testamenti, Evangeliorum libri quatuor; Actuum Apostolorum, liber unus; Pauli apostoli Epistolae, tredecim; ejusdem ad Hebræos, una; Petri apostoli, duae; Joannis apostoli, tres; Judæ apostoli, una; et Jacobi, una; Apocalypsis Joannis, liber unus.*[2]")

The Council adds: "This shall be communicated to our brother and colleague Boniface, or other bishops of those regions,[3] for the ratification of this canon, as we have it transmitted to us by the

[1] See also p. 106. Ineger Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ, Græce et Latine, cap. xxxiv.

[2] Kirchhofer (p. 12) and Dr Wordsworth, (Append., p. 33,) both professing to follow the edition of Mansi, (vol. iii., p. 891,) have omitted the *Epistle of James* But the Greek code of the canons of the African Church (c. 34) says—Ἰακώβου ἀποστόλου μία. With this agrees also the code in the library of Cambridge University, E.E. iv. 29, (Westcott, Gen. Survey on the Canon, 185.) Kirchhofer also gives the same canon twice in his collection, at p. 13 (according to Bruns) and at p. 503 (according to Gerhard von Maestricht, Brem., 1772). The epistle of James is wanting in the one, and is given in the other.

[3] *An ancient manuscript, (vetustus codex,)* says Labbé, (Consil. ii., p. 1177,) contains these words (*sic habet*):—"For the ratification of this canon, let the Church beyond sea be consulted," (*In confirmando isto canone, transmarina Ecclesia consulatur.*)

Fathers that these are the books to *be read* in church. It shall, however, be allowable to read the sufferings of the martyrs in celebrating their anniversaries."

("Hoc etiam fratri et sacerdoti [1] nostro Bonifacio vel aliis earum partium episcopis, pro confirmando isto canone, innotescat quia [2] a patribus ista accepimus in ecclesia *legenda*.

"Liceat enim legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur.")

93. We shall have to return to what regards the Apocrypha in this catalogue of Carthage. To dwell on it at present would distract our attention from the canon of the New Testament, to which we wish first to confine our inquiry. We shall merely remark, before passing on, that if this catalogue seems to differ from that of Laodicea about a *fact*,—about an *expression*,—the discordance, so far as regards the New Testament, is only apparent and external. As to the *fact*, the council decrees that those ecclesiastical books, the reading of which had been so often authorised by the ancients, but which the Council of Laodicea had thought proper to prohibit, should be read in the course of public worship. As to the *expression*, the council, in applying to these books the title *canonical*, employs the word in a more extended signification than that which it had borne during the first four centuries, and uses it in the sense of *libri regulares*, books fitted to regulate Christian sentiments and conduct. Such use of the term, says *Cosin*, was unknown till after the fourth century, and even then was very rare. We shall have occasion, further on, to explain the mind of the council in employing the term, as Augustin, who was present, (we are told,) never ceased to assert an essential difference between *divinely-inspired scriptures* and *canonical books*, and as he never appeals on this point to the decisions of the Council of Carthage, as if the question had been there disposed of.[3]

[1] Other editions, as that of Binius, read—*Et consacerdoti nostro.*

[2] For *quod*, as in Greek—Γνώριμον ἔστω ὅτι . . . . κτ. τ.

[3] See, further on, what we have said on the doctrine of Augustin.

CHAPTER XIII.

SUMMARY OF ALL THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

94. We have, then, marked, in reviewing the space we have passed over, that the voice of the universal Church, ever unanimous, from apostolic times, on the first canon, and unanimous, from the date of the Council of Nice, on the second, finally became, in the course of the fourth century, unanimous on the second-first likewise. The temporary and late hesitations of the Churches of the West regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews had already almost entirely disappeared; and the temporary and late hesitations of the Churches of the East, regarding the Apocalypse, had, from the early part of the fourth century, disappeared likewise. The canon was thus, universally and for ever, recognised in all the Churches of Christendom.

CHAPTER XIV.

VULGAR PREJUDICES WHICH A GLANCE AT THESE FACTS OUGHT TO HAVE REMOVED.

95. In presenting a brief summary of these facts, it may be of importance to specify various erroneous notions and groundless fears that have too often been entertained within the Christian Church. The believer must be on his guard against the confused and delusive echoes that proceed from the schools of science, and which, from being repeated from mouth to mouth, finally obtain a usurped importance, and assume the dangerous semblances of scientific reality. Thus originate inveterate prejudices, laxity of principle, and pernicious doubts. When a smattering of science, with a tone of authority, has once diffused, in a Christian community, devious opinions and inaccurate assertions, unstable minds allow themselves to be led away. They come to imagine that such and such a science, in the recesses of her sanctuary, has, lying before her, unquestionable facts, unanswerable discoveries, to overturn such and such statements of Scripture. The dupes feel assured that none will be found rash enough fairly to enter the lists with this irresistible opponent, but that all who possess even the slightest share of discretion, will keep as far as possible out of her way. The truth, however, is, that, if any one will but firmly meet this dreaded adversary face to face, and closely scrutinise her pretensions, the phantom will vanish. This has been exemplified, during the last two centuries, in the great question of *various readings*. It was formerly supposed by many that critical science had in her possession irresistible facts to combat Scripture, and completely overturn its authority. Yet, the result has been that earnest inquirers, by turning from superficial to accurate erudition,

have speedily found that the fallacies of the opponents of sound Christianity will not stand the test, and that all attempts to shake the fabric of the faith by arguments from various readings, have but served to make it more firm than ever. The same will be the case in regard to the canon.

"We do not hesitate to maintain, without fearing the charge of presumption," says Dr Thiersch,[1] "that, in the whole compass of historical inquiry, there is not a department in which a greater mass of prejudices and fallacies have been adopted than in this—to form a system which still exercises a tyranny over minds otherwise highly enlightened."

There exist, then, in connexion with the canon, erroneous motives and pernicious prejudices, which it is of importance to specify before we proceed further. The following are some of them:—

96. First, Many persons speak of the list of sacred Scriptures as if it had furnished nothing but uncertainty to Christians for three centuries, and as if the Divine authority of the books of the New Testament had never been distinctly recognised till the end of the fourth. It is, however, on the contrary, an incontestible fact, that the *first canon* was, at no time, anywhere an object of any uncertainty to the Churches of God, and that all the writings of which it consists, that is, eight-ninths of the New Testament, were, from the moment of their appearance, and through all succeeding ages have been, universally recognised by all the Churches of Christendom.

97. Second, Many persons speak of the *antilegomena*, or five short and later epistles, which we call the *second canon*, and which form only the thirty-sixth part of the New Testament, as if they had not been recognised in apostolic times. This, too, is a mistake. They were not, it is true, *universally* recognised at first, (and we shall point out the cause;) but, from the very first, they were recognised by *most churches* (τοῖς πολλοῖς) and by most (τοῖς πλείστοις) ecclesiastical writers.

98. Third, People also speak of the *second-first canon* as if the two books of which it consists had not been universally received

[1] In his interesting "Essay on the Canon." "Versuch zur Vorstellung der historischen Standpunkte für die Kritik der neu-testamentlichen Schriften."

as canonical till a very late period, whereas, on the contrary, they were at first universally received both in the East and in the West; and it was only at a later period, the commencement of the third century, and on grounds of pure internal criticism, (never in reference to external evidence,) that one of these books, always regarded in the East as of Divine authority, was, for a time, questioned in the West; and the other, always viewed as of Divine authority in the West, was, for a time, questioned in the East.

99. Fourth, Many persons speak of this hesitation of a small number of churches, in reference to the *antilegomena*, as having been prolonged to an advanced period of the fourth century. This also is a mistake. It may be seen from all the catalogues of the fourth century that the discordance in question ceased in the churches as soon as they met by representatives in a general council.

100. Fifth, Many profess to regard the hesitation of a portion of the primitive churches on the second canon as a fact painful to Christian piety. This is a very gross mistake. We will shew that, on the contrary, the fact, far from tending to disturb our faith, is fitted to strengthen it, as it clearly proves, on the one hand, the firmness, the holy jealousy, and unceasing vigilance of the primitive Christians in reference to the canon, and, on the other, the perfect liberty with which they examined its claims, sifted its peculiarities, and, in certain cases, contested its authority. All these circumstances prove most forcibly that if, notwithstanding this constant jealousy of the primitive churches, and notwithstanding the entire liberty they exercised on this head, they shewed themselves always so unanimous in receiving the twenty books that form the first canon—it was not blindly, it was not without examination, it was not in obedience to human authorities, that they did so, but that, on the contrary, it was solely because they had before them solid, clear, and irresistibly-convincing evidence, which compelled them to adopt the general decision. This is the only explanation that can account for so full, prompt, and universal an assent on the part of men so vigilant, so jealous, and so free.

Thus the temporary existence of these very doubts on the part of a minority of the primitive churches contributes in two ways

to the confirmation of our belief. On the one hand, their existence proves to us that, in everywhere receiving the first twenty books of the New Testament, the churches had done so because they could not discover the slightest ground for hesitation, and, on the other, the universal disappearance of those same doubts on the subject, demonstrates in like manner that the churches were constrained by irresistible evidence when at length they universally received the second canon with the same unwavering conviction with which they had from the beginning received the first.

101. Sixth, Many, also, for the purpose of weakening the authority of the Scriptures, and exalting tradition, have often attempted to shew that the Church, during her earliest and brightest period, proceeded without the written word, and lived solely on the spoken word and tradition. This, too, is a fallacy. No congregation in the primitive Church ever assembled without the reading of the oracles of the Old Testament, which formed the first and principal part of the service. It was always held that the Holy Scriptures are "able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

After the example of Jesus and His apostles, the Church was always nourished with the written word, and by it was constantly strengthened in hope and faith. Those Scriptures never ceased to be a lamp unto the believer's feet. "Search them," said Jesus, "for they testify of me."

102. Seventh, Many, finally, speak of the canon as if the definitive fixing of it had been the work of councils, the act of the Church uttering her voice by decrees. This, too, is a fallacy, and entirely at variance with the facts of the case. It is of importance to establish the truth on this point here, though we propose to revert to it elsewhere, when we treat of the most essential grounds of our belief in the canon of Scripture.

No human authority interposed in this matter; the determination of it was simply and purely the offspring of conscience, inquiry, and liberty. The Churches of God, enlightened by mutual testimony, settled the canon from conviction, under the secret and omnipotent guidance which will ever watch over the

written word. The first canon was universally determined by the Churches of Christ ere any council whatever was held; and the councils, when they began to be convoked, discussed every other point but the fixing of the canon. We shall afterwards demonstrate with greater precision that, for fourteen centuries, no general council ever pretended to fix the canon by a decree, as we have already shewn that even the two provincial councils of Laodicea and Carthage, too frequently appealed to as having established the canon by enactments, cannot be justly regarded as having come to an authoritative decision on the question that now occupies our attention.

The reader may be here referred to the works of Lardner, who proves, by long quotations from the Fathers, that the canon of the New Testament was never settled authoritatively.[1] Basnage may be consulted, who devotes three chapters to the same thesis in his History of the Church.[2] Read Le Clerc, who, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, under the years 29 and 100, says, "There was no occasion for a council of grammarians to declare authoritatively which are the genuine works of Cicero or of Virgil. In like manner, the authenticity of the Gospels was established and maintained without any decree of the rulers of the Church. The same remark applies to the apostolic epistles. They owe all their authority, not to the decision of any ecclesiastical assembly, but to the concurrent testimony of all Christians, and to the tenor of their contents."

Augustin said, thirteen centuries before Le Clerc—"We know which are the writings of the apostles in the same way as we know which are the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and others; and as we know which are the writings of other ecclesiastical authors—from the testimony of their contemporaries, and of persons who lived in the ages that successively followed."

Let it suffice here to say, that the ancient Fathers, in forming their decisions on the canon, appealed solely to the free and unvarying testimony of the churches; while, at the same time, they added a careful scrutiny of the books they were invited to receive.

[1] Supplement, p. 50–52, Second Part, vol. i.; vol. vi., pp. 325, 381; vol. ii., pp. 325, 496, 529, 576; vol. viii., pp. 102, 225, 268; vol. x., pp. 193, 207, 208.

[2] Book viii., chaps. v., vi., and vii.

In giving in their catalogue, they never pretend to publish them either as results of their own discoveries, or of the decisions of any authority whatever. They record the mind of preceding ages—the unbiased testimony of the primitive Christians—the evidence they had received from their predecessors by continuous transmission from the days of the apostles.

Origen, who was born 142 years before the Council of Nice, does not, in putting forth his catalogue of the canonical Scriptures, (*τῶν ἐνδιαθηκῶν γραφῶν,*) confirm it by a reference to the decisions of any council, but merely to the testimony of the early Christians, (*οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες,*) and to uninterrupted historical evidence, (*ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθών.*) His words have been preserved to us by Eusebius, who adds, in quoting his testimony as to the Gospels: "Origen follows tradition and the *ecclesiastical canon;* [1] and he testifies that only four Gospels have been unanimously received by all the churches under heaven." [2]

Eusebius himself, in expressing his mind on the books of the New Testament, and on their division into books universally received and books controverted, makes no reference to any authority or any council, but presents his catalogue as resting on ecclesiastical tradition, (*κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν.*) [3] Athanasius, likewise, who was born in the year 296, puts forth his catalogue, identical with ours, as grounded on "testimony communicated to the Fathers by those who had been eye-witnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning." [4] But he does not refer to any council, and merely enumerates the books that were *recognised as forming the canon, handed down and held as of Divine authority.*[5]

Not one author, either of the fourth, or fifth, or *sixth century*, appeals, on the subject of the canon, to the decisions of any council. Thus, when Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem, who was born (it is believed) twenty years after Athanasius, gives us his cata-

[1] Hist. Eccl., vi. 25—Τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα.

[2] "Α καὶ μόνα ἀναντίῤῥητά ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[3] Hist. Eccl., iii. 25—οἱ ταῦτας παραδόντες.

[4] Festive Epistle, xxxix.—Καθώς παρέδοσαν τοῖς πατράσιν.

[5] Τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία.

logue of inspired books,[1] he refers to no council, and only appeals to "the apostles, and the ancient bishops who presided over the churches, and transmitted to us those books as inspired." [2]

Likewise, when Augustin, about the end of the same century, or rather the beginning of the fifth, wrote an answer to certain persons who had inquired of him "which books were truly canonical," he simply referred to the testimony of the various churches of Christendom, and not to any council whatever. [3]

Likewise, when Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, about the year 340, gives his catalogue, (also identical with ours,) he simply professes to present "the tradition of their ancestors, who had transmitted these books to the churches of Christ, as divinely inspired," and he declares that he gives it just as he had copied it from the records of the Fathers. [4]

Lastly, when Cassiodorus, a Roman consul in the sixth century, gives us three catalogues of the books of the New Testament, (one from Jerome, another from Augustin, and another from an ancient version,) he, too, makes no reference to any decree or to any council. [5]

Let it, then, be no longer said that the authority of councils fixed the canons of Scripture. It was, indeed, fixed; but the authority of councils had nothing to do with it. It was the will of God that Christians individually, and Christian congregations, enlightened by the testimony of successive generations of believers, should form their opinions on the subject of the canon with entire liberty of judgment, that the authenticity of the sacred books might be rendered more manifest.

We shall afterwards examine this important fact under another point of view. But the evidence here given will suffice to shew how erroneous and how entirely at variance with facts it would be to persist in seeking for the origin or settlement of the canon in any ecclesiastical decree.

[1] *αἱ θεόπνευστοι γραφαί.*

[2] Catech., iv., 33.

[3] De Doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. ii., vol. iii., Part i., p. 47. Edit. Paris, 1836. (He began this book in 397, and finished it in 407.) See also Lardner, vol. x., p. 207.

[4] In Symb. Apost., p. 26—"Quæ secundum majorum traditionem per ipsum Spiritum Sanctum inspirita creduntur et ecclesiis Christi tradita, competens videatur in hoc loco evidenti numero sicut ex Patrum monumentis accessimus designare."

[5] Lardner, vol. xi., p. 303.—Cassiod, De Institutione Divinar. Litterar., cap. xi.

CHAPTER XV.

INFERENCE FROM ALL THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

103. THREE cardinal facts and three important questions result from this lengthened review, and the combined testimonies of these fourteen catalogues, the bequest of four centuries, and of which the first was put forth at the death of John, about the end of the first century; the second at the death of Irenæus and of Clement of Alexandria, about the end of the second century; the next at the approach of the fall of Roman paganism, about the end of the third century; and the eleven others, during the fourth, between the time of Eusebius and the death of Gregory of Nazianzus, or the Council of Carthage.

104. In the first place, from the first fact—the constant and universal unanimity of the Churches in maintaining the twenty books of the first canon, this striking fact confirmed from century to century, and denied by none—arises the first question: On what is this constant, free, marvellous, universal unanimity grounded? How was it produced?

The answer to this question will form the subject of our Second Book. It will confirm our reliance in the full authenticity of the first canon; it will increase our respect for the Holy Scriptures, and dispose us to submit more implicitly to their guidance.

105. Along with this first fact, another presents itself, which is, that, besides the twenty books of the first canon, the two epistles which form the *second-first* canon shared, from their first appearance till the middle of the third century, the same universal recognition as the *homologoumena*. This second fact gives rise to

this second question: Whence originated the objections to these two books after that period? What were the nature and extent of these objections, and how was the authenticity of the *second-first* canon established after this subsequent and temporary opposition?

The answer to this second question will be the subject of our Third Book.

106. Lastly, from the same testimonies results a third fact of no less importance, which is, that the five brief epistles, forming the second canon, and amounting to only a thirty-sixth of the New Testament, though received by most churches, were not, however, received by all, and were universally recognised as of Divine authority only from the date of the Council of Nice, twenty-five years after the close of the third century. Hence arises the third and last question: How is it possible that the *antilegomena*, if they are authentic, should not have been received from the period of the death of the apostles? How did they come to be received ultimately, and how does it happen that the partial opposition they experienced does not invalidate their authenticity, and even detract from the perfect certainty attributed to the other books of the canon?

The answer to the various aspects of this question will form the subject of our Fourth Book. Afterwards, as we have said, we shall, in Part Second, enter on a field totally different, and present to our readers a novel class of proofs, in our estimation, still more cogent, in support of the canon.

We now pass on to Book Second.

BOOK II.

OF THE FIRST CANON—HISTORICAL BASIS OF ITS AUTHENTICITY.

107. THE perfect authenticity of the *first canon* is founded on such an assemblage of proofs that the literary history of ancient times cannot furnish a similar instance of complete and irresistible evidence. Accordingly, it was at first our intention to dispense with the formal demonstration of so manifest a truth. The *homologoumena*, we felt, are impregnable in point of testimony; and the only object we proposed to ourselves in the present work was to establish on a solid basis the authenticity of the *antilegomena*. Our labours are intended for the benefit of such earnest believers as, notwithstanding their faith in Divine revelation, are troubled with objections erroneously supposed to be derived from science, and, in consequence, require to have their views settled by the testimony of science itself more accurately consulted. We afterwards became convinced that a glance at the irresistible evidence in favour of the *first canon* would aid inquirers in perceiving the authenticity of the *antilegomena* also, and serve to strengthen our faith in the entire canon.

108. Our readers have already seen, in Book First, and will be pleased to keep in mind, in perusing Book Second, that nearly all

the arguments in support of the first canon, so far as regards the first two centuries of the Church, equally apply to the two books of the second-first canon; that Eusebius himself had, accordingly, classed them among the *homologoumena*.

We shall begin with the proof so clearly flowing from the primitive, constant, and universal unanimity of all the Churches, in regard to these twenty-two books.

CHAPTER I.

FIRST GREAT HISTORICAL FACT—THE COMPLETE AND UNVARYING UNANIMITY OF THE CHURCHES.

109. THE simple review, contained in Book First, of all the authentic catalogues bequeathed to science by the early ages of the Church, must vividly strike every attentive inquirer.

Fourteen catalogues, at least, have been furnished us by the three centuries immediately succeeding the death of the apostles. We say *at least*, because to these might be added two others, known as the catalogue of Amphilochius and the Muratori document.[1] All these, taken together, constitute the concurrent testimony of the most learned and the most venerable men both of the East and of the West. This testimony, too, is not, on their part, a mere expression of individual conviction, but a public utterance of the mind of the Christian community. It is a unanimous recognition of a great historical fact, a fact uncontested and uncontestable—the witness of all the Churches in the world regarding the first canon. Such, we say, is the voice of all preceding ages, the voice of the whole Christian people, from the days of the apostles—a voice invariably precise, clear, and unhesitating. We have listened to all the traditions of ancient times to ascertain whether even one discordant sound might reach us from within the compass of the ancient Church, and we have been able to perceive none. We have looked across the expanse of ages to descry aught that might warrant even the slightest doubt, and the eye has not discovered, from the one extremity of the vast horizon to the other, even the most minute speck of contradiction, much less any "cloud, even of the size of a man's hand."

[1] See our Propositions, 31, 61, 78, 82, and 191–196.

And what sort of witnesses to attest to us the mind of their age were an Origen, a Eusebius, an Athanasius, a Cyril, a Gregory of Nazianzus, a Jerome, an Epiphanius, an Augustin? Did ever witnesses exist that had better means of information, were more competent to judge, more worthy of credence? They occupied the most elevated positions; they were spread over all parts of the known world, and at great distances from each other. Some of them were on the banks of the Euphrates or of the Nile, or of the Save or the Rhone; others were on the coasts of the African Syrtis, or on those of the Euxine. Who more worthy of credence? They had nearly all suffered for the gospel; nearly all had hearts so imbued with so fervent a love for the Holy Scriptures, that they had shewn themselves willing to die in their defence. All of them were so sincere and so fearless in their inquiries as to announce without reserve all they knew. They spontaneously inform us that, besides the *homologoumena*, there are five brief epistles of a later date than the rest, which, though received by most people, were doubted by some; while, as to the other twenty books, they tell us that no hesitation regarding any of them had ever been heard of in any church in the world. Were there ever witnesses more discerning or better acquainted with the facts of the case? They were all men of learning; all profoundly versed in the Scriptures; all had travelled for the interests of the Word of God, both in the East and in the West. They had visited Rome and Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem; they had met in the councils; and they all possessed so extensive and accurate an acquaintance with Christian antiquity that, in this respect, modern scholars are but children in comparison. What a witness, for instance, at the commencement of the fourth century, or end of the third, was a Eusebius, who, in order to draw up, in 324, his history of the origin and progress of Christianity, made himself master of the whole field of ancient literature; ransacked the libraries collected at Cæsarea by Pamphilus, and at Alexandria by Alexander; and read all the writings, now lost, of Aristion, Quadratus, Aristides, Hegesippus, Papias, Tatian, and Melito, of which modern scholars hardly know anything except through Origen. What a witness, likewise, a hundred years before Eusebius, was an Origen, "he of brazen entrails," as he has been called, who, from the end of the second century, de-

voted all the energies of his genius to scriptural researches, and who had been himself a disciple of Clement of Alexandria, whose birth was only forty years later than the death of the apostle John.

110. From this imposing evidence may be drawn the following four conclusions:—

1st. Where so large a number of persons, so well informed, so sincere, and so unshackled, tell us from all parts of the world, that, after having carefully studied the history of the churches of God, from the days of the apostles, they were not able to discover among Christian communities, till the beginning of the third century, the slightest difference of opinion regarding the authority of all the books of the first canon; we must admit that all antiquity does not present to us a single historical fact so completely established as this unvarying unanimity of the churches.

2d. This unanimity is so complete as to exclude the very possibility that a single book of the *homologoumena* would have obtained such recognition had it not been originally received during the lives of the apostles, and under their sanction.

3d. It would, in like manner, have been absolutely impossible, after the death of the apostles, for so many thousand churches, spread over all the earth, to have immediately consented to receive into their canon any additional book, even had that book been previously received by a large portion of the churches on the best evidence of its apostolic authenticity, as was afterwards the case with the *antilegomena*. Such a book could never have obtained reception in so many thousand churches in Egypt, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Greece, Spain, Africa, Italy, and Gaul, without encountering for a long time scruples, opposition, and reservations, the sound of which would have reached the ears of such men as Origen, Cyril, Athanasius, and Eusebius.

4th. If such a posthumous reception into all the churches on earth has been accomplished in regard to the *antilegomena*, so as to silence all opposition, this fact, in the highest degree improbable till it actually took place, can only be humanly accounted for by the overflowing evidence that these books, though late in being universally received, were found to possess in their favour.

111. But if, shortly after the death of the apostles, an attempt

had been made to interpolate the primitive canon of twenty-two books communicated to all contemporaneous churches by the apostles themselves, and to effect the posthumous insertion of some additional book; it is impossible to admit that such additional book, though recognised by most of the churches, could have been at once unanimously received to the ends of the earth. The very supposition is such as no man in his senses could entertain. It would, if possible, be still more absurd to imagine that such a book could, after the death of the apostles, have obtained universal admission into the canon, even in churches the most independent of each other, without resistance, without discussion, without objection, and without delay; and all this in such a manner as to leave no trace to indicate that any resistance or objection had ever been made. To fancy that in such a manner an additional book could have found admission into the list of apostolic writings, and even have the same rank assigned it, would be pushing our hypothesis beyond all the limits of possibility.

Yet it is necessary to admit all this, if the primitive recognition of the twenty-two *homologoumena* did not take place before the decease of the apostles, and during their active ministry.

112. It is thus established by irresistible historic evidence that not one of the *homologoumena* was received into the canon after the death of the apostles.

CHAPTER II.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TWENTY-TWO HOMOLOGOUMENA OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IS ESTABLISHED BY INCOMPARABLY STRONGER EVIDENCE THAN WHAT EXISTS IN FAVOUR OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF ANY OTHER BOOK OF ANTIQUITY WHATEVER.

113. WITH this majestic unanimity of evidence before us we can fearlessly maintain that in the whole compass of ancient literature there is not a book to be at all compared to our first canon, as to the complete demonstration of its authenticity. History does not present a similar instance of literary evidence. Should any doubt the accuracy of this assertion, let him mention a single book in favour of the authenticity of which a tenth part of the same proof can be produced. "The testimony to its genuineness," says Michaelis, "is infinitely superior, and that in numerous respects, to anything that ancient literature could present to us in favour even of the most abundantly-attested books."

The immense inequality, in such comparison, will appear from ten or eleven peculiarities.

114. Even the most eminent profane works were addressed merely to individuals, by authors unconnected with each other; and most frequently they were not addressed to any person at all. The writings of the New Testament, on the contrary, were addressed by the apostles to the churches of their time; that is, by eight public personages to large associations of individuals by whom they were known, and whom they knew, spread over the earth, permanently settled, unrestrained, connected with the apostles, and with each other, by the closest relations, and the most sacred ties.

This is the first powerful guarantee of authenticity exclusively belonging to the writings of the New Testament.

115. Even the most authentic and the most distinguished works of antiquity, how eagerly soever they may have been welcomed by contemporary readers, never awakened among them anything at all to be compared to the intensity of interest with which the primitive Christians received the Scriptures. To the readers of heathen works it was of no great importance to be preserved from error respecting the genuineness of the books, and the identity of the author. Their endeavours to ascertain the real authorship would naturally correspond to the amount of the interest at stake. They risked but little in falling into a mistake in regard to Tacitus, Pliny, Plutarch, or Cicero. All their efforts to find out the real truth in the matter would be limited. But the case was very different with the primitive Christians to whom were communicated, in the name of the apostles, the books in which these holy men had spoken under the impulse of the Holy Spirit. It was a vital question whether or not any particular book was written by any of the *apostles or prophets on whom the Church of the living God is built as its foundation, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.*[1] For these living oracles every believer was ready to endure the extreme of torture. His Christianity, his faith, his salvation, were involved in the trial.

This is the second powerful guarantee belonging exclusively to the Sacred Scriptures.

116. When the writings of heathen antiquity made their appearance, their contemporaneous readers, for the most part, were neither eye-witnesses nor competent judges of the facts those works report. Our sacred books, on the contrary, appeal to facts which the whole primitive Church and every individual believer could verify by the evidence of the senses. Living witnesses, actors in the work, ministers known for twenty years to all contemporary Christendom, miracles performed in their own days, congregations who had been present when they were performed, prophecies, gifts of tongues, cures that continued to be wrought during the

[1] Eph. ii. 2–20.

lives of the apostles,[1] and during the succeeding generation, that is, till the commencement of the second century.

This is the third guarantee, rendering all mistake in the primitive churches on the subject of the canon a matter of impossibility.

117. The productions of ancient literature which have come down to our times were put forth without the aid of any association of men specially intrusted with the task of verifying their origin and watching over their transmission. The books of the New Testament had for these purposes the churches and their bishops, on the one hand, and, on the other, the college of apostles, whose long career extended to the end of the first century. Paul alone had disseminated the gospel from Arabia to Jerusalem, from Jerusalem to Illyria, and beyond Illyria to Italy, and, perhaps, further west,[2] encumbered as he was daily with the care of all the churches.[3] Peter was for thirty years at the head of the evangelisation of the circumcised, as Paul was in respect to the circumcised,[4] and John, till the commencement of the second century, had the superintendence of the churches of Asia.

This is the fourth guarantee of authenticity, entirely wanting in favour of the most incontestable writings of heathen antiquity.

118. The most celebrated works of the ancient world were, no doubt, perused by contemporaries with eagerness; but their popularity was subsequently transferred to other productions no less valued, and they were consigned to neglect for ages. But how different was the case with the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament! Believers continued to refer to them unceasingly, copied them with their own hands, earnestly and constantly studied them; the most barbarous tribes learned to read only in order to become minutely acquainted with their contents; the followers of Christ *meditated on them day and night*[5] from generation to generation, for, since the days of David, such was ever the practice of "the righteous," who unceasingly made the Scriptures the light, the guide, and the consolation of their lives.

This forms a fifth guarantee of authenticity, belonging exclusively to the sacred canon.

[1] See Gal. iii. 2; Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 27.
[2] Rom. xv. 19, 24.
[3] 2 Cor. xi. 28.
[4] Gal. ii. 8, 9.
[5] Ps. i. 1–3.

119. The writings even of the most eminent of the ancients might in a brief space of time disappear and be lost, without exciting great emotion on the part of any one, and, in this manner, in fact, have perished a great number of the finest works of antiquity, even of such as were at first preserved with the greatest care: the Hortensius of Cicero, nearly the whole of Varro, the works even of Menander, which almost everybody knew by heart, those of Ennius and of Pacuvius, three-fourths of Livy, the great history of Sallust, the greatest part of Tacitus, the books of Pliny the Elder on the war in Germany, the last part of the Fasti of Ovid, sixty books of the Roman History of Dio Cassius, twenty-five books of the Bibliotheca of Diodorus Siculus, and nearly the whole of Polybius. Greatly as these works were valued by antiquity, they have been lost. Such, however, could not have been the case with our sacred books, for, besides the eagerness of every Christian to possess a copy of them, they were preserved in innumerable places of worship in all parts of the world, and all true ministers of Jesus Christ, as history testifies, were at all times ready to surrender their lives rather than be deprived of the Scriptures.

This forms the sixth guarantee of authenticity, exclusively belonging to the canonical Scriptures.

120. In regard to most even of the masterpieces of antiquity they were not translated into various languages till many ages after their first appearance. The books of the New Testament, on the contrary, were, at the beginning of the second, and even before the close of the first, translated into all the principal languages of the East. They were translated first into Syriac, then into Arabic, Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Persian, and afterwards into Ethiopian. In the West, they were translated first into Latin, afterwards into Gothic, Sclavonic, Celtic, and Anglo-Saxon. We have already spoken of the *Peshito* and its high antiquity. A Latin version was made during the earliest days of the Church. It is believed that the *Vetus Itala*, in common use till the time of Jerome, was completed before the end of the first century, and we find Tertullian already quoting it towards the end of the second.

Such, then, is a seventh guarantee of authenticity, exclusively belonging to the canonical Scriptures.

121. The productions of ancient literature did not give rise, like the books of the New Testament, to controversies almost contemporaneous, the sound of which, reaching our own times, serve indirectly, but, for that very reason more forcibly, to establish their authenticity. As to the books of the New Testament, on the contrary, the very attacks against them serve to prove the anterior existence of the canon, the apostolicity of its authors, and its reception by the primitive Christians, so that the earliest unbelievers and the earliest heretics attest with irresistible force, by their very hostility, the apostolic authenticity of our sacred books. In combating the doctrines of the Scriptures, these enemies recognise the respective writers, and unconsciously and unintentionally bear witness to future ages that these books were, previously to their attacks, already revered by the whole Christian Church as the code of its faith. They contest their teaching, but not their authenticity. They reject them as erroneous, but not as spurious. They load them with odious abuse, but, at the same time, admit them to be written by the apostles whose names they bear.

We shall return to this subject more in detail; but it was necessary to make brief reference to it at this stage, as the incidental testimony of enemies is, perhaps, of more weight than that of all the orthodox Fathers.

Such is an eighth guarantee of authenticity, to which there exists nothing equivalent in favour of any other production of literary antiquity.

122. Even the most distinguished writings of the ancients are comparatively little quoted by the authors of succeeding ages. With our Holy Scriptures the case is quite otherwise. Quoted, commented on, interpreted, employed to furnish texts of sermons, by an uninterrupted series of ecclesiastical writers, they might, had they been lost, have been, as Lardner remarks, entirely reconstructed from the quotations contained in the writings of early Christian authors. The works of the whole series of Fathers would almost seem intended to furnish materials for this very purpose. We have already spoken of the immense labours of Origen on the whole of the Scriptures. Irenæus, before him, during the second century, in Gaul, copiously quoted from every one of the *homologoumena*. Clement of Alexandria, during the

same period, quoted them in Egypt. As for Tertullian, who was born about the middle of the second century, he so copiously quoted by name all the books of the first canon, and of the second-first, in Africa, that, according to the remark of Lardner, were we to collect all the passages of the New Testament quoted in his writings, their amount would be greater than all the quotations made from Cicero during two thousand years by all writers that are known to exist.

Such is the ninth special guarantee of the authenticity of the New Testament.

123. There is a tenth peculiarity which of itself would constitute an immense distinction between the writings of the New Testament and all the other literary productions of antiquity. The latter were perused, however, extensively by individuals detached from each other, and the reading of them thus furnished no collective guarantee for their authenticity. The Holy Scriptures, on the contrary, were, from the days of the apostles, read by permanent associations established for the purpose,—read uninterruptedly from week to week and from day to day—read in every country then known—read so repeatedly that often individual believers knew them all by heart—read invariably, in a word, during worship, from the days of the apostles, as they are still read at the present day, and as they will continue to be read in every living church till the day that Jesus Christ shall appear from the heavens.

This tenth guarantee, more strong, perhaps, than all the rest, will again require our attention more in detail.

124. Lastly, there is a further circumstance of emphatic significance in favour of the New Testament, which does not apply to the documents of classic antiquity. In connexion with these, there existed no continuous order of earnest guardians, jealously occupied in verifying their authenticity, and watching, with a holy severity, in order to exclude all books that were doubtful, and give their sanction to no one till its authenticity was fully established. In regard to the Scriptures, on the contrary, we can trace from the days of the apostles the uninterrupted existence of such a body of examiners and guardians.

A close attention to the history of the churches will shew that, from the commencement, they were in possession of twenty-two

books, received during the lives of the apostles, and that not the slightest opposition to any of these in any church whatever was heard of during two centuries; that, however, during the same period, five short letters, addressed to certain individuals or certain churches, were not received unanimously, though recognised by the majority, (πλείστοις,) but were, in certain parts of the world, regarded, for a time, as doubtful. This reserve, freely maintained in reference to a very small portion of the canon, (the thirty-sixth,) gives additional force to the unanimous assent accorded to all the rest. "From the close of the first century," says Dr Tiersch,[1] in his useful work on the canon, "the churches henceforth left to themselves, and more than ever jealous of the sacred deposit, shewed themselves watchful to prevent innovations, and actuated by a thoroughly conservative spirit, and determined to regard the collection of genuine scriptures as for ever closed, till they obtained the fullest evidence that such and such a late epistle, which had long been held as apostolic by a great number of churches, was really of Divine authority." Still they did not venture to issue a decision of their own regarding its authenticity, and admit it into the canon, notwithstanding the mind of the majority in its favour, but confined themselves to declaring, that not having received it at their foundation, they waited, in perfect liberty, for fuller proofs on the subject. It was thus that, on the one hand, their admirable firmness in regard to the first canon, and, on the other, their holy vigilance and increasing jealousy in reference to the second, furnish us with one and the same testimony, and equally serve to confirm our belief.

Had their not been in some churches more or less hesitation in regard to the late epistles, there might have been ground for suspecting that there existed on their part too much facility and indifference in receiving and transmitting the canon. But the difficulty felt, for two centuries, by a portion of the churches regarding these five epistles,—that holy slowness to receive them, joined to their dread of rejecting them,—that prudent and yet respectful disposition which for a time neither ventured to condemn nor to sanction them,—that long and scrupulous hesitation, suffi-

[1] Chap. iv.—*Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des hist. Standpunkts für die Kritik der N. T. Schriften.* 1845.

ciently indicates the wisdom with which they acted, the liberty with which they examined, and the mature deliberation that preceded their decision.

These striking facts, then, all taken together, bestow new force on the unshaken and unanimous testimony to the first canon.

125. What has already been said might be sufficient for completely establishing our thesis, and justifying us in fearlessly asserting that this unanimity of all the churches in the world, combined with all the incomparable circumstances accompanying it, gives the first canon, or rather the twenty-two *homologoumena*, a certainty unequalled by any in the whole compass of ancient literature.

Complete, however, as the evidence here produced may already be, it is of importance to exhibit it in a still stronger light, by pointing out the causes of so marvellous an agreement. To what human circumstances is this great historical phenomenon to be attributed? This is the question we are going to examine in the following pages; and the inquiry will open up new sources of evidence to confirm the authenticity of our canon.

We shall first examine, in the following chapter, three other historical facts, which, while they illustrate the character of the primitive Church, explain to us how the astonishing unanimity of the people of God all over the world, in reference to the first canon, came to be so promptly established.

CHAPTER III.

THREE CAUSES, ESPECIALLY, PRODUCED THIS PROVIDENTIAL UNANIMITY.

SECTION. I.

THE LONG CAREER OF THE APOSTLES.

126. THE first leading fact which pre-eminently affected the character and condition of the primitive Church, and which was necessary to produce throughout the whole Christian community the unanimity to which we refer, was the great length of the career of the apostles, notwithstanding the unceasing toils of their lives, and the numberless perils of their ministry. This fact appears still more remarkable when we consider their position in the world, "as sheep among wolves." "Alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake," as they themselves tell us; "persecuted, but not forsaken, cast down, but not destroyed," "accounted as sheep for the slaughter," they were nearly all, by the providence of God, spared for a ministry of thirty, fifty, and sixty years.

127. From the earliest ages of the world, God, we perceive, whenever He intended to effect any great and enduring revival, always took care to bestow a long career on the individuals appointed to accomplish it, and thus granted to them the necessary time to consummate and consolidate the work.

After driving man from Paradise, He granted to each of the early patriarchs a life of nearly nine hundred years, to enable them to maintain among their children's children, to the twentieth generation, the knowledge of the fall and of the promise. The son of Enoch, who had been for two centuries and a half a con-

temporary of Adam, was likewise, for nearly six centuries, a contemporary of Noah, appointed to be to a new world "the preacher of that righteousness which is by faith." When the earth had been purified by the deluge, God thought proper to spare Noah for three centuries and a half more to instruct the new generations that sprung from his loins; and preserved Shem, Noah's second son for seventy-five years, to the call of Abraham, the father of believers. At a later period, when God brought His people out of Egypt, to give them their institutions, laws, and promises of grace, He added forty years to the venerable age of Moses, and likewise twenty-four years to that of Joshua, the son of Nun, that these two great men might have full time—the one in the desert, and the other in Canaan—to train Israel to the new discipline of the written Word. When, at the end of the rule of the Judges, He resolved, as a preparation for the line of the prophets, to effect that revival in which "all the house of Israel lamented after the Lord," He placed at the head of the nation, for fifty years, the prophet Samuel. When He introduced the regal order, and the temple worship, He gave Israel two prophet-kings, each of whom reigned forty years. When, finally, He determined to rally His people round His Word of Life in their Babylonish captivity, He preserved to them Daniel for seventy years. If we come down to more recent times, we shall perceive that, in like manner, at the holy Reformation of His Church through the gospel, God gave to the churches of Germany, on the one hand, and to those of Geneva and France, on the other, thirty years of the ministry of Luther, thirty years of that of Calvin, thirty-three of that of Farel, and forty-six of that of Beza.

128. Now, if such an arrangement was so often required to accomplish in the Church great changes decreed from on high, it was especially required in the first century when God was to constitute the Christian people among the Jews and among the Gentiles, intrusting to believers for all succeeding ages the oracles of the New Testament, and impressing on the whole Christian community, in the vast renovation that was taking place, a powerful and majestic unity. It was necessary that the apostles, appointed to this great work, should be granted a long life for the purpose of watching, continuously and in concert, under the guidance of the

Holy Spirit, over the progress of the churches, the arrangements of their worship, and, above all, the universal reception of the Holy Scriptures. It was necessary that the churches, duly exercised in the life of faith previously to the decease of the apostles, should be left, till Christ's second coming, to the sole direction of the Holy Spirit and the written word. And this is what took place.

129. With the single exception of the brother of John, James the Greater, (who suffered martyrdom by order of Herod Agrippa only ten years after the ascension of our Saviour,) all the apostles exercised a very long ministry in the Church.

James the Less, the brother of our Lord, and the first of the three pillars of the primitive Church, (Gal. i. 18,) remained eight and twenty years at the head of the churches of the circumcision, and died only in the year 62; and yet all the other apostles survived him, some of them even thirty and some forty years. Esteemed by the Jews, and styled by them "the Just," he was so revered that the Talmud mentions certain miracles "wrought by James, the disciple of Jesus the carpenter;" and Josephus, relating, according to his own notions, James's martyrdom, (Antiq. xx. 8,) declares that the wisest of the nation deplored his death as one of the principal causes of the ruin of Jerusalem, and of the wrath of God against the Jews. Simeon, who was, like him, one of the brothers of the Lord, became, as historians inform us,[1] bishop of Jerusalem immediately after the death of James, and, if the statement of Eusebius be correct, was crucified in 107, when much more than one hundred years old, after having presided over the Christians in Jerusalem during forty-five years. Peter and Paul superintended the churches of the Gentiles as well as those of the Jews, during a ministry of thirty years and more; for we must fix the martyrdom of both between the burning of Rome in July 64 and the death of Nero in June 68. Besides, it appears that most of the apostles attained a still greater age. Though we cannot place entire confidence in the too varied traditions of the Fathers, according to whom Mark died at Alexandria in 68, Timothy in 97, Thomas and Bartholomew in India, Jude in Lybia, Matthew,

[1] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 2, 32, 11.

according to Rufinus, among the Ethiopians, or, according to others, among the Parthians; the infallible books of the Acts and the Revelation of St John are sufficient to put it beyond doubt, first, that all the rest of the apostles survived Paul, Peter, and the two Jameses; and, secondly, that John, banished to Patmos, during a persecution which began under Domitian, and terminated in 96, returned to the shores of Asia to write his "Revelation," and end his days there. His brother James had, forty years before, opened the list of apostolic martyrs, (in 43,) and he himself was to complete that list of the sufferings of the apostles long afterwards, at the beginning of the second century.[1] All ancient traditions agree in representing him as having reached an extreme old age. He could no longer walk, says Jerome, and was carried to the meetings of the faithful.[2] He had, it is said, preached among the Parthians, and even in India; but what seems incontestable is, that, having settled at Ephesus with the mother of Jesus, and there terminated his earthly career at a very advanced age. Jerome tells us that his tomb was to be seen there. Both Irenæus and Eusebius[3] assure us that he died there under Trajan, in the third year of his reign. According to others, he died in 103. If Epiphanius is correct, (Hær. 51,) he was then ninety-four. According to others, he was still more.

130. When we consider the uninterrupted intercourse of the apostles with the churches they planted, their long career is a fact of vast importance, as it gives irresistible force to the unanimous testimony of Christendom regarding the twenty-two *homologoumena*. It explains that otherwise inexplicable unanimity. It makes it not only easy to conceive, but a matter of course. If it is admitted that the apostles and their inspired assistants exercised so long and so genial a ministry in the churches for more than half a century, it becomes abundantly obvious that all the churches would in consequence exhibit the most perfect agreement in their views of the twenty-two books already put forth by the apostles and evangelists before their decease. On the other hand, follow

[1] He was sentenced several times, but died a natural death.

[2] See Jerome on the Epistle to the Galatians, and De Viris Illust., cap. ix.

[3] Irenæus—Hæres., iii., 3; ii., 39. Eusebius—Hist. Eccl., iii., 23—Chron. Euseb. See also Augustin, Serm. 253, chap. iv.

the inverse line of argument, the striking fact of such unanimity throughout the churches, and we perceive, in like manner, that these twenty-two books must have been communicated by the apostles, and that these men of God had superintended the use of them in the Christian community. It is equally clear that, after so long an apostolic superintendence, none of the churches could, after the death of the apostles, have been induced to receive any additional book, which none of the apostles had ever mentioned, and that, most especially, a large number of churches could not have received it, and certainly could not have received it without objection or opposition, or without a surviving trace that any objection to it had ever been made.

We have already said—but it is well to repeat—that there is not in history, there is not in criticism, a supposition so absurd as not to be admissible, if we are to regard the possibility of such reception as having even the slightest shadow of probability. Let us, for a moment, place ourselves in the situation of those primitive Christians, and ask how, after half-a-century's ministry of so many inspired men, we could have received, after the death of the apostles, any additional book which they had not communicated during their lives. With what spirit of holy jealousy should we have armed ourselves to repel every novelty, to protest against every intrusion, to reject every book that had not in its favour the clear sanction of these men of God!

We shall have occasion to point out afterwards how much force this argument receives from the history of the five late epistles.

131. It is thus manifest that there exists a logical connexion between these two unquestioned facts—the long ministry of the apostles in the primitive Church, and the perfect uniformity of that entire Church regarding the *homologoumena*, and, in addition, a still more necessary connexion between these two facts and the authenticity of all these books.

Were we told at the present day that the author of a modern work had for forty years watched over all its successive editions all over Europe, and were we informed, moreover, that, at the end of these forty years, no bookseller in Europe had the slightest doubt of the authenticity of the book in question, would not such unanimity be considered sufficient and unquestionable evidence?

And yet, in how much more complete a form is this twofold guarantee—the long superintendence of the author and the unanimity of booksellers—exhibited in favour of the New Testament? Instead of one author, we have eight. We have all the apostles jointly and severally guaranteeing the work. We have men of God, we have their inspired companions—Mark, Luke, Simeon, Timotheus, Apollos, Silas, Barnabas,[1] and so many others—who presided over the churches during half a century. Instead of the booksellers of Europe, we have all the churches—all the churches in the world. And, instead of one book, we have twenty books, in reference to which the most complete unanimity of testimony is direct, universal, unvaried, and immovable.

132. There is another characteristic feature of the primitive Church that must be kept in view, in order to feel all the force of this double guarantee,—long superintendence and complete unanimity. This is the intercourse so uninterrupted, so intimate, so varied, that existed between the apostles and the churches, and between the churches themselves. This feature appears in all the details of their history, and in all existing traditions respecting them. Numberless facts bearing on this point have been recorded, of which we do not warrant the authenticity. We are told, for example, that the apostle John, in the last part of his career, settled at Ephesus, as at a common centre of Eastern and Western Christendom, where he might stretch out both his arms to the churches of the East and of the West. We are told by numerous ancient witnesses (Caius,[2] Eusebius,[3] Jerome,[4] Victorinus,[5] Chrysostom,[6] Theodorus of Mopsuestia[7]) that the bishops of Asia presented themselves to him at Ephesus, and requested him to draw up for the use of the churches of God a gospel that might complete the Gospels already published. Tertullian[8] and Jerome[9] inform

[1] Acts xiii. 1—προφῆται—2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14.

[2] About 196. In the famous Canon called Muratori's, which many attribute to him.

[3] H. E., iii., 24. [4] In Matt. Procem. [5] In Apocal. Bibl. Patr., iii., 418.

[6] Auct. Incert. Montfaucon, viii., 132.

[7] Cabena in Joan. Corderii. Mill. N. T., p. 198. Edit. 1723.

[8] If this fact were admitted, it would not at all affect the inspiration of this fourth Gospel.

[9] Tertull. De Baptismo, 15 and 17. Jerome, Catal. Vir. Ill., in Luc., 7.

us that a presbyter of Ephesus having put forth a book entitled "*The Acts of Paul*," was by the apostle convicted of imposture, though the writer tried to excuse himself by alleging a pious intention of doing honour to the memory of Paul. In selecting these statements from a collection of so many similar traditions, our object is simply to shew what vigilance the apostles exercised for half a century. We seldom appeal to mere traditions, and usually refer only to the facts of Scripture as authentic history; but the tradition we here repeat serves of itself to throw light on the subject. Indeed, the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles fully shew the unceasing solicitude of these men of God, and particularly of Paul, for the welfare of the churches they had planted. He himself tells us that he had continually "the care of all the churches," from Jerusalem to Illyricum, from Rome to Macedonia and Asia. He was constantly visiting them. He traversed for this purpose the whole empire. He suffered shipwreck, in the discharge of his apostolic duty, four times.[1] He was often "in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by the Jews, in perils by the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in cold and nakedness." He sent to the churches his companions in the ministry; he received from them letters and messages; he required to know their condition;[2] he wept in his prison at Rome on hearing of the waywardness of certain Philippians; he was refreshed when he received good news from the churches; he was incessantly struggling in prayer for each of them, and even for such of their members as he had never seen; he adjured them in the name of the Lord that his epistles should be read by all the brethren, and that they should be communicated by one church to another,[3] just as Peter afterwards recommended the reading of the epistles of Paul as well as of the rest of the Scriptures;[4] he constantly inquired into their condition with the solicitude of a mother desiring to know the state of the child at her breast;[5] he watched over their religious views with a

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 25-27; Acts xxvii. 41. [2] 1 Thess. iii. 5-8; Philip. ii. 19-29.
[3] Philip. iii. 18; 1 Thess. iii. 8; Col. i. 9, ii. 1-5, iv. 12; Rom. xv. 30; Philip. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2; v. 27; Col. iv. 16. [4] 2 Pet. iii. 16.
[5] Gal. iv. 18; Philip. iv. 17, ii. 28, iii. 18; Col. i. 8, 9, 24; 1 Thess. iii. 6-10.

holy jealousy; he was in the deepest concern when they were wandering from the truth;[1] "who is weak," he exclaimed, "and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?"[2] "My little children," he says to the Galatians, "of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you."[3]

133. It is easy, then, to perceive that, during such a ministry, which, in the case of some of the apostles, was extended to periods of fifty, sixty, and almost seventy years, it was impossible that any spurious book could be introduced into the Church; and that the churches should unanimously ratify a book that had not been acknowledged by these men of God.

134. It is, in like manner, easy to perceive that, after the death of the apostles, at the conclusion of so lengthened a ministry, all the churches would inevitably be deeply imbued with a religious respect for all apostolic institutions, and a conservative spirit carried to the greatest height, and a jealous distrust regarding every article of doctrine that had not been sanctioned by the apostles during their lives, and, above all, suspicion regarding every book which, previously to the death of the apostles, had not obtained a place in the sacred canon. Owing to these causes, the latest writings of some of the apostles, which, shortly before their death, they had addressed to various churches, encountered opposition down to the time of the Council of Nice, as we shall have occasion to state more in detail, and only mention here by anticipation. We shall, however, at the same time, shew that these five short books were received by the great majority of Christians, owing to the positive proofs of their authenticity, and received, in particular, by those churches whose position best enabled them to decide, as it was to them that the books in question were addressed, as they were thus most interested in rejecting them if spurious. We shall, further, shew that these same facts afford an admirable proof of the vigilance of the churches, of the freedom of their action, and of the thorough conviction that produced their unanimity regarding the twenty-two *homologoumena*.

We have, however, to consider two other historical facts still more important, which furnish additional evidence regarding our sacred canon; and which, combined with the great fact of the

[1] Gal. iv. 19, 20. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 29. [3] Gal. iv. 19.

unanimity of all the churches of the first centuries in reference to the *homologoumena*, demonstrate with a force that is irresistible the authenticity of all these books.

SECTION II.

THE IMMENSE NUMBER OF CHURCHES AT THE DEATH OF THE APOSTLES.

135. The triumphant rapidity of the conquests of the Church previously to the death of the apostles, and its immense extent at the end of the first century, form an amazing fact, but a fact as unquestionable as prodigious.

136. This new religion, which avowedly aimed at the annihilation of all others, and which, taking its rise among persons of humble condition, and in the most despised of all the nations of the earth, denounced all error, openly assailed every evil passion of the human heart, and spared neither the pride of the great, nor the pretensions of the priesthood, nor the prejudices of the multitude;—that religion which, while it declared war against all the false deities that had been worshipped with so much splendour from the most remote ages, was at first preached only by persons of low degree, and yet called upon mankind to recognise their God in the person of a Jewish carpenter, who had been rejected by his own people, and through them brought to capital punishment; that religion which was opposed by the people, the priests, the religious teachers, the magistrates and kings, of every nation; that religion which required every individual to regard himself as a criminal in the sight of God, and to give up for its sake his property and his life; that religion which, though unceasingly persecuted, had for three centuries shed no blood but its own;—that religion had already in forty years put forth a power that foreboded the conquest of the world. In forty years it had traversed the globe; it had overflowed its surface as the Nile overflows Egypt; it had spread itself everywhere like a river of life. The apostles had not yet terminated their career when there appeared in every land missionary churches, devoted, and without number.

Perhaps this remarkable fact does not occupy an adequate place in the minds of those who turn their attention to the study of the

canon. It is, however, a fact of vast significance; and at the same time it is abundantly established from both those sources of proof—between which the investigators of Christian antiquity divide their preferences—the declarations of Scripture, and the testimonies of history.

137. Scripture leaves no doubt on this subject. Paul, after only seventeen years of his ministry, states, in addressing the Christians at Rome, (xvi. 26,) that the "gospel had been already made known *to all nations;*" that he himself (xv. 19) "strove to carry it exclusively to parts where it was previously unknown;" and yet that he had fully preached it in all the regions "from Jerusalem to Illyricum." The voice of the messengers of the glad tidings had gone forth, like the light of the sun, "through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world," (Rom. x. 18.) This statement was no poetic hyperbole; and from his success may be inferred what had been achieved by the labours of all the other apostles and evangelists. Besides, in thus spreading the gospel all over the earth, they had been merely carrying out the command and fulfilling the promise of their Master. Jesus, in foretelling to them the destruction of Jerusalem, that was to take place thirty-six years after His death, had declared to them that, previous to that event, the "gospel of the kingdom should be preached all over the world as a testimony to *all nations.*" "Go, then," He had said to them, "and convert *all nations.*" This command was in a short space of time so fully carried into effect, that Mark, in writing his Gospel, (xvi. 20,) could already say of the apostles, "They went forth and preached everywhere," (*ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ.*) Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, says to them, (about the year 60,) "The gospel is come unto you, as it is *in all the world;* and bringeth forth fruit." He adds, in ver. 23, "The gospel, which ye have heard, and which has been *preached to every creature that is under heaven.*"

Only four years after these words had been written, the same gospel, though violently persecuted by the Emperor Nero, already counted, as Tacitus informs us, "an immense multitude" of followers in the city of Rome alone. Paul, six years before he wrote to the Colossians, was preparing to proceed to Spain,[1] and there is

[1] Rom. xv. 24.

nothing improbable in the supposition that he actually did proceed thither, as Clement of Rome[1] tells us that he went to the utmost bounds of the West, (ἐπὶ τὸ τερμα τῆς Δύσεως.) But even if Paul's journey to Spain may be considered uncertain, it is an unquestionable fact, that, in the year in which he was preparing to go to that country, the Christian Jews in Jerusalem alone amounted to at least fifty or sixty thousand, (*how many myriads, πόσαι μύριαδες εἰσὶν πεπιστευκότων*, said James.)[2] So extensively had the gospel been propagated at the same period in Italy, through the humble but incessant labours of believers, that, long before the appearance of any apostle in that country,[3] very numerous conversions had taken place. "The faith of the Romans was spoken of throughout all the world" when Paul wrote to them, (Rom. i. 8.) When, three years afterwards, he landed in Italy for the first time, he already found near Naples, at *Puteoli*, brethren to receive him, as also at the distance of seventeen leagues from Rome — at "*Appii forum*," and, still nearer, at "*the Three Taverns*." Six years afterwards, but before Paul had laid down his life for Jesus Christ, the Christian inhabitants of Rome, forming "*an immense multitude*," were enduring in masses the most fearful tortures inflicted by imperial madness.

138. It is fortunate, we have already said, that, in proof of these incontestable facts, we have, in addition to the testimony of Scripture, that of two of the most illustrious personages of Roman antiquity—both contemporaries of Paul,[4] both heathens, both deeply prejudiced against Christianity, both men of consular dignity,[5] both men of letters, both practical statesmen, and both testifying what they had seen. I allude to Tacitus and Pliny the Younger.

139. It is well known that Tacitus has written, in the form of "Annals," a history of his own time, from the death of Augustus to that of Nero. In book fifteenth, which comes down to the eleventh year of the latter emperor's reign, that is, A.D. 64, when Paul was still preaching the gospel, Tacitus mentions the terrible

[1] Chap. v. of his First Epistle to the Corinthians.
[2] Acts xxi. 20.
[3] Rom. xv. 20; 2 Co. x. 15, 16.
[4] One born in the year 61, and the other in 64.
[5] Tacitus was consul in 97, and Pliny three years later.

conflagration that ravaged the capital of the empire, and which all attributed to Nero. "Eleven of the fourteen quarters of Rome had been destroyed by it. To remove suspicion from himself, Nero," says Tacitus, "sought for persons to be believed the guilty authors of the devastation, and subjected to the most cruel tortures unfortunate beings, abhorred, indeed, for their abominations, and called *Chrestians* by the common people, (*quæsitissimis pœnis affecit quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Chrestianos appellabat.*) *Chrestus*, after whom they were called, having been put to death under Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate, a measure which for a time checked that execrable superstition. But soon the torrent burst forth anew, not only in Judea, where it had originated, but even in Rome itself—that centre where all the abominations of the universe are ultimately collected (*superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem mali, sed per urbem ipsam . . .*.) Those who avowed themselves to be Christians were first taken up, and, afterwards, on their depositions, *an immense multitude*, convicted, less of having been implicated in burning Rome than of hating all mankind."

An immense multitude, (*multitudo ingens*,)—such is the testimony of Tacitus regarding the number of Christians living in Rome even in the time of Paul.

"The most obstinate scepticism," says the infidel Gibbon on this subject, "is compelled to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, which is further confirmed by the accurate Suetonius, for that historian likewise mentions the punishments inflicted by Nero on the Christians," (ch. xvi.)

140. As to the multitude of *Christians in Asia*, we have, in like manner, a testimony of Pliny, no less authentic and precious. An intimate friend of Tacitus, and high in the favour and confidence of Trajan, Pliny was then proconsular governor of the beautiful provinces of Bithynia and Pontus, and had received from his master instructions to prosecute the Christians, and inflict on them capital punishment, should they persist in the faith. When, however, he commenced the iniquitous task, the immense number of the victims appalled his conscience. This led him to address to the emperor a letter, still extant, (lib. x., epist. 97,) in order to obtain some mitigation of the rigour of his first

instructions. That remarkable letter, written while John was still alive, (in the year 103,) well deserves an attentive perusal. We shall merely present, in an abridged form, that part which mentions the innumerable multitude of the Christians, and their steadfastness in the faith, for on the shores of the Black Sea, as on the banks of the Tiber, whenever it was necessary to confess Jesus Christ, their persecutors beheld them (to use the words attributed to Julian the Apostate) coming in haste, like bees to the hive, to meet martyrdom for the name of Jesus, (*tanquam apes ad alvearia, sic illi ad martyria.*)

On commencing proceedings against the Christians, he was startled at once by the number and the harmlessness of the crowds he had to punish. "What is to be done, my lord?" said he to Trajan. "The manner in which I have acted towards those denounced as Christians has been this: I ask them whether or not they are Christians. On their replying in the affirmative, I repeat the question once, and afterwards again, threatening to put them to death if they persist. As to those who continue obstinate, I order them to be led to punishment, for whatever may be the nature of their religion, I have thought that their opposition and obstinacy at least deserve to be punished. They declare that their only offence consists in meeting together on a certain day before sunrise, to sing hymns alternately to Christ as to a God, and to bind themselves by an oath not to commit perjury, nor adultery, nor theft, nor falsehood. After this they separate to meet again, without any disorder, at a repast which they take in common. Having ascertained these particulars, I deemed it necessary to question by torture two female slaves from among those who are said to exercise a certain ministry among them; but I could discover nothing but an extreme and wretched superstition. What must I, then, do? The case appears to me very serious, especially on account of the vast number of persons of both sexes, of every rank and every age, who are already or will be under persecution, (*multi enim omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus, etiam vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur.*) It is not merely in the cities that this superstition has spread, but also in the towns and villages, and even in rural districts, (*neque enim civitatis tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est.*")

141. In a word, this great fact which we have pointed out is constantly appealed to as an unparalleled event by all the ancient apologists, often with eloquence and exultation, as it deserves. Read, for example, the noble passages in Tertullian, or in Arnobius,[1] or in Minutius Felix.[2] "We are so numerous," they say to the Romans, "that if we were to secede from your state, we should cause its ruin."

"We are but of yesterday," said Tertullian[3] to the Roman government, "and we have filled your empire—all that is yours,—towns, islands, fortresses, municipal towns, market-places, the senate, the forum. We have only left you the temples, (*sola vobis relinquimus templa.*) We can make war upon you without taking arms; it is enough not to live with you; for if the Christians who compose so great a multitude (*tanta vis hominum*) should abandon you and retire into some other country, it would be the ruin of your power, and you would be terrified at your own solitude." "The Gothic nations," he says elsewhere,[4] "the various Moorish tribes, all the regions of Spain and Gaul, and places in Britain inaccessible to the Romans, have been subjected to Christ, as well as the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, Scythians, and nations yet unknown." After this survey, he expresses his admiration that in so short a time the empire of Jesus Christ was far more extensive than that of Nebuchadnezzar, of Alexander, or of the Romans.

142. This period of the Church, signalised by such a marvellous increase, reaches to the reign of Hadrian, (117–138.) Christianity had then made its way even to barbarous nations, and numerous churches had been founded among the Egyptians, Celts, and Germans. We may here notice "those many nations of barbarians" (*πολλὰ ἔθνη τῶν βαρβάρων*) to whose judgment Irenæus[5] appeals against the *Gnosis* of the heretics of his

[1] Adv. Gentes, lib. ii., p. 44, 45. Lugd. Batav., 1651.

[2] In his dialogue, entitled, Octavius.

[3] Apologet., ii., cap. 37.

[4] In his book Adversus Judæos, chap. 7.

[5] Hæres., iii., 4, 2. He also says, (i., 2,) "The Church is disseminated throughout the whole habitable world, (*καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης,*) and even to the extremities of the earth," (*ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη.*)

time,[1] affirming that these nations had been christianised before the appearance of the Gnostic sects. But it is well known that scholars place the birth of these sects in the age of St John, and even before the publication of the fourth Gospel.[2] If we believe the most trustworthy statements of the learned Armenian, Moses of Chorene,[3] Christianity had penetrated the East very early among the people using the Syriac language, the Armenians, and the Persians. We must read the thirty-seventh chapter of the third book of Eusebius to form a just idea of the prodigious extension of the gospel in Trajan's reign, and the admirable activity of the churches to effect it. Allowing for some inflation of language, this grand historic fact is brought to light, that "the immediate disciples of the apostles, building on the foundation laid by those men of God, had scattered the seed of the kingdom of heaven throughout the whole extent of the habitable globe," (*τὰ σωτήρια σπέρματα τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἀνὰ πᾶσαν εἰς πλάτος ἐπισπείροντες τὴν οἰκουμένην.*) Many of them, he says, sacrificed their property to follow the vocation of evangelists, to announce Christ to those who knew Him not, and to communicate to them the scriptures of the divine Gospels, (*καὶ τὴν θείων Εὐαγγελίων παραδιδόναι Γραφήν.*)

143. It will be perceived what additional strength this wonderful fact gives to the testimony rendered by the universal Church to the *homologoumena* of our sacred canon. But to apprehend the full force of the argument, the three great facts we have been dwelling upon must be taken in combination; for then, it seems to us, they will form a powerful threefold cable round these twenty-two *homologoumena* to maintain their apostolic authenticity, and render them immovable. There is, first, the continuity, during the whole of the first century, of the personal ministry of the apostles in the churches; then there is the immense number of churches founded in all parts of the world during this long and

[1] The heretics of his time, like those of the present day, called their systems *science* or *knowledge*, Γνῶσις, *Gnosis*, and denominated themselves "men of Gnosis."

[2] See Bunsen in his Hippolytus, i., 236.

[3] He has left a history of Armenia. Born, it is said, in 370, he kept the archives before being made archbishop of Bagrevand. See Neander's Church History, vol. iii., 162. Bohn's ed.

vigilant ministry; and lastly, there is the constant, perfect, universal unanimity of these innumerable churches on the question of these books during the lifetime and after the decease of the apostles, and in the following age. Whoever attentively considers these three combined facts will acknowledge that, for splendid guarantees, none like them are to be found in the literary history of the whole world in any age.

144. We here quote with pleasure the words of Dr Thiersch.[1] After employing similar arguments, "I hope," he says, "I have succeeded in shewing the opponents of the first canon how far their suppositions on the characters of the first half of the second century have wandered from the domain of history into that of fable. They would have us suppose that, at a time when, certainly, the general body of Christians and their bishops did not look like a gang of false coiners, men were to be found among them so exceedingly clever, (religious men, too,) that, in some incomprehensible manner, they were able to impose their fictions on all the Christians in the world as on a stupid multitude, blind and dumb to insanity, and to make them receive with closed eyes their forgeries, under the title of apostolic scriptures, and of scriptures transcribed by a believing antiquity! And when the light of history is brought to bear upon it, this is the drift of the strange idea that a single one of the *homologoumena* may have been a forgery. And we must avow, that incredulity in reference to the first canon, when persisted in, requires the admission of such incredible and preposterous things, that, in comparison with such gullibility, the blindest belief of some Christians in certain miraculous legends is a mere trifle."

But we have not yet done with the facts; we have still another to bring forward, perhaps more important than all the preceding. It will make our proofs superabound. We wish to speak of what is termed *Anagnosis*, or the public reading of the Scriptures, (*ἀνάγνωσις*.)

[1] Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des hist. Standpuncts für die Kritik der N. T. Schriften, 1845, ch. 6.

SECTION III.

ANAGNOSIS.

145. The regular and constant practice of publicly reading the Scriptures in all the churches of the New Testament is a cardinal and pregnant fact in the question of the canon. This fact is so important, that it justly claims the first place; for we must perceive that on this institution actually rests the whole history of the sacred volume. *Anagnosis* is its formative cause and true foundation; this alone explains its truth—this alone its perpetual preservation—this alone the admirable unanimity of the churches in acknowledging from the first, and for two centuries, all the *homologoumena*—this alone explains the œcumenical unanimity of all the churches, at a later period, in receiving the entire canon.

146. The modern opponents of our sacred books, especially in Germany, have so well understood the competency of this great fact to establish invincibly the authenticity of the first canon, that they have done their utmost to gainsay the reading of the New Testament in the primitive churches, and to fabricate an apocryphal and tardy birth of such a practice in the latter half of the second century. But these efforts have been in vain. The existence of this institution, and its universality from the earliest period, can be clearly demonstrated. We shall see that it goes back to the apostolic times—that it belongs to the very genesis of the universal Church—that, at the beginning of the second century, in all the churches then ancient, it had been perfectly established, and that in all those founded since, by thousands in the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, (that is to say, from 98 to 138,) *anagnosis* had begun with their very existence, and formed an essential part of it.

147. It was very naturally, and in the logical course of events, that this usage took its rise with the Church itself. The apostles and their divine Master had already found it established in the synagogues of Israel. *Anagnosis* had been for ages one of the universal practices of the ancient worship as regards Moses and the prophets. All the synagogues were founded for this purpose.

Orders were given, the Jewish doctors say, to erect a synagogue wherever ten Jews could be found; and wherever a synagogue existed, it was furnished with a chest containing the Scriptures, and everywhere these Scriptures were publicly read to the faithful every Sabbath-day. And it is well known that, in the days of Jesus Christ, the Jews were spread over the whole world, and that "Moses," as St James expressed it, (Acts xv. 21,) "hath of old time in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day."

And, on the other hand, it is a historical fact that the primitive Church was from the first modelled on the synagogue.[1] All the Christian Churches, for many years, consisted entirely of Jews. The Church was originally composed only of Israelites brought in a short time by myriads to the knowledge of Jesus Christ, either at Jerusalem and in Judea, or in Samaria, or in the cities of the Gentiles. On receiving the gospel, all these new Christians preserved the forms and practices of their worship to which they had been used in the synagogue. Their ministers were called *Chazan* in the Aramean congregations, or *Episcopoi* among the Hellenists. Each of them had three *parnasin* or *deacons*. The *Chazan* every Sabbath-day appointed seven *Koreim* or readers (*anagnostæ*) to attend to the reading of the Holy Word. He kept himself near the reader, watching if he read correctly, and correcting him if he made a mistake. On the other days of the week there were readers, but not so many.[2] Thus this sacred usage, which had prevailed in all the synagogues as the most indispensable part of the service, passed into the Christian Churches formed at first in the synagogue, continued after its pattern, and composed entirely of Jewish converts. These first Christians could not imagine an assembly without these sacred readings; the idea of public worship without *anagnosis* could not have entered their minds. It was thus that this institution, being naturally established in all the assemblies of the new people

[1] On the derivation of Christian churches from the synagogue, see Archbishop Whately's Essay on the Kingdom of Christ, pp. 78–82, second ed., 1842; or the French translation by Burnier, 1843, pp. 66, 67.

[2] See Lightfoot's Harmony, p. 479, and his Horæ Hebr. et Talmudicæ in Evang., &c., vol. xi., p. 88, quoted by Whately in the appendix to his Essay on the Kingdom of Christ, p. 256, (or 215 of the French translation.)

of God, necessarily gave them their form, so that it would have been practised as a matter of course, even had there been no injunction on the subject in the apostolic writings; but there was one, as we are about to shew.

148. *Anagnosis*, then, in the Christian assemblies, preceded the appearance of the New Testament, instead of a long time having elapsed, as has been asserted, before it was practised. The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament were read as in the synagogues; and that regular reading of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, was exclusively in use during the fifteen years which preceded the appearance of the first apostolic epistles, in the innumerable churches formed by the apostles, and particularly in those founded by Paul before the year 49 or 54 in Samaria, Syria, Arabia, Cyprus, Galatia, Lycaonia, Mysia, Pisidia, Thrace, and Macedonia.

It is, in fact, in 49 that we think (according to Orosius [1]) the decree of Claudius against the Jews of Rome (Acts xviii. 2) must be placed; and we know it was then that Paul, with Silas and Timothy, wrote those two beautiful epistles to the Thessalonians, which were, it would seem, the beginning of the written word of the New Testament.[2]

149. As we have said, it was necessarily from the time of the apostles and the first promulgation of the gospel that the custom of reading the Scriptures of the Old Testament passed from the assemblies of the synagogue into the assemblies of the Church; for no sooner had the year 70 arrived, no sooner had Jerusalem been destroyed, the temple burnt, the Jewish believers dispersed, and all the apostles gone to their rest, than the spirit of the Christian churches (as all history testifies) became too hostile to

[1] VII. 6. The third year of Claudius. Others place it in the second year. Suetonius speaks of the decree in his life of Claudius, but without giving the date.

[2] We do not pretend to fix the date of Matthew's Gospel; for it is very probable, as Lardner thinks, that none of the four Gospels preceded the Council of Jerusalem, (Acts xv.,) if that of Mark must be placed late, (Mark xvi. 20,) and that of Luke at a later distance of time from the publication of the Acts, (the years 60, 61, 62.) Yet the fact reported by Eusebius (H. E., v. 10) of the Gospel of Matthew in the Hebrew language, (Ἑβραίων γράμμασι,) which the apostle Bartholomew carried to India, seems to place the first Gospel very near St Paul's first epistles, or rather even before them.

the Hebrew nation and to the Judaising Christians, to allow henceforth of borrowing anything from their institutions.

150. Moreover, the custom of reading in these assemblies of the Church, besides the scriptures of the prophets of the Old Covenant, the scriptures of the apostles and prophets of the New, (as far as they were published,) was one which must necessarily have approved itself to all the churches and to all the faithful, as at once most natural and indispensable. Were not the writings of the apostles superior in their eyes even to the writings of the Old Testament? Did not these men of God, at the time when they wrote, perform works of power much more wonderful than the greatest of the ancient prophets had ever accomplished? Were they not, as apostles and prophets, the twelve founders of the Church? (Eph. ii. 20.) And besides, did not their writings (the Gospel of John, for example, and the Apocalypse of John) claim to be inspired from on high as much as Isaiah or the Pentateuch? Why, then, and how, by what right and for what reasons, was it possible, while they read every Lord's-day the scriptures of the ancient prophets, to leave unread the scriptures of the new, and while they listened to those prophets who had divinely announced the Son of man, to doom to silence those prophets who had heard His own voice, and had divinely proclaimed Him, "God bearing them witness with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost?" (Heb. ii. 3, 4.)

Can we believe that all these Christian societies, after the death of their founders, the apostles, could be content to read publicly only the Old Testament, and to hear, after that reading, nothing but the discourse—the λόγος of which Justin Martyr[1] speaks—the *unpremeditated discourses* of ministers who had neither the miraculous spirit with which the departed apostles had been filled, nor even the *charisms* of the apostolic men who followed them. This cannot be admitted; even the bare thought of it must not be entertained.

151. If, as certain opponents of the canon would have it, the public recognition of the books of the New Testament by *anagnosis* did not take place till the latter half of the second century, they must solve for us two historical impossibilities. In the first

[1] In his First Apology, chap. 67.

place, how can it be admitted by any one who has studied the character of the second century in the original authorities, that such a revolution was effected in the public worship of all the churches in the world—a change so important that it would be absolutely incompatible with the conservative and traditional spirit that history attributes to the Christians of that epoch? And, in the second place, how would it be possible that so great an event, which has not its parallel in the annals of that epoch, could take place without any commotion, without any report of it having come down to us, without any of the fathers having spoken of it, without even Eusebius, who relates so much in detail all the reminiscences of those primitive times, being apprised of it, and without Irenæus, in whose youth this astounding fact must have occurred, saying a word about it? No one can give an answer to these simple questions. It is sufficient for us to enunciate them, to shew that they do not allow of one.

152. Thus for any one who contemplates by the light of these facts the primitive Church performing its worship, and reverently listening every Sunday to the voice of the readers, nothing is more easy to conceive than the successive formation of the first canon; nothing can be more naturally explained than the unanimity of all the churches as to its contents and constant preservation. All was accomplished without dispute or noise, by the calm and regular course of *anagnosis*. Only suppose ourselves present at this consecrated practice of the first century, and all is explained. To settle this great affair, we have no need of councils, or of agitation, or of efforts, or of decrees. The apostles had not even to create the institution by their directions, (though they really have given them;) it existed before their time—"from ancient generations" (ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων);[1] it maintained itself during their life; it acquired permanence after their death. At the most, they had only to sanction it by their approval, and by the part which they took in it. And when, after a half-century of *anagnosis*, they all disappeared from the earth, the Christian churches had everywhere such a perfect knowledge of their sacred canon by continual reading, that simple believers were often to be met with who had thus learnt their scriptures by heart, and could correct the *anag-*

[1] Acts xv. 21.

nostes (the reader) if he mistook a single word.[1] Historians attest this fact. We can thus understand that nothing but this practice was needed to create the canon, and to make it known in its purity, to sanction it in every place, and to render it irrevocable.

153. We see, then, that the reading of the Old Testament never ceased, either in the synagogue or the church; it existed in the first assemblies at Jerusalem; it was always an indispensable part of their service; it passed afterwards from the congregations of Jewish Christians to those of the Gentiles; for example, it followed the Corinthian believers into the house of Justus,[2] and from the synagogue of Ephesus entered the school of Tyrannus,[3] for all knew, as St Paul had said,[4] that by the reading of the Holy Scriptures, "the man of God is perfected, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and made wise to salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus." At a later period, as a new epistle or a new gospel was given by the apostles to the churches, believers were anxious to add to the reading of the Old Testament that of these new prophets, whose writings, they knew, proceeded from the same Spirit which had been shed upon them in greater abundance and plenitude.

154. Possibly, though we do not affirm it, the *anagnosis* of these new books was not so frequent as long as the churches had still in their midst either the apostles possessed of the great signs of apostleship[5] or men invested with those *charisms* (or supernatural gifts) which the apostles had conferred upon them by imposition of hands for the common benefit. Yet it remains evident that the churches, when deprived of the personal teaching of these men of God, and only having in their possession the writings they had left, took good care not to abandon the usage to the individual piety of every Christian in his own house, and offered them publicly for the edification of all by a solemn and regular *anagnosis*.

[1] Such, for example, as John the Blind in Palestine, St Anthony in Egypt, and Servulus at Rome. Eusebius, De Martyr. Palest., xiii., p. 344; Augustin, De Doct. Christ., in prologo., tom. iii., p. 3; Greg. Mag., Hom. xv., in Evangelia., tom. iii., p. 40.

[2] Acts xviii. 7.

[3] Acts xix. 9, 10.

[4] 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

[5] 1 Cor. xii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 12.

155. In this manner the successive recognition of all the books of our sacred canon prevailed in the churches of God effectively, but without any parade; and, as Dr Hug has remarked, (in his *Introduction to the New Testament*,[1]) as the publication of a work of profane literature was anciently made by its recital before an assembly of the author's friends,[2] so for the books of the New Testament, it was their *anagnosis* in the church to which they had been originally sent, that very soon consigned them for the use of all the people of God to the œcumenical treasury of their sacred books.

156. Yet though we have shewn, by the simple logic of facts, how this anagnosis of the apostolic scriptures would necessarily be established in the primitive churches, even had there existed no injunction of the apostles on this point, we ought not to forget that such an injunction was actually given by them; and any one may be convinced that they composed their epistles and their other writings with the intention that they should be read in the assemblies for worship.

157. As to the apostolic injunction, we must carefully observe that it was given by Paul with remarkable solemnity in the very epistle which was the first published of the writings of the New Testament: "I charge (or adjure) you by the Lord," he wrote to the Thessalonians,[3] "(*Ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Κύριον*) that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." He adjures them by the Lord. And when, towards the end of his career, he wrote from Rome to the Colossians, he gave them the same injunction: "And when this epistle is read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans (*καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ*); and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea" (*τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας*).[4]

Could the churches on receiving such orders fail to perceive that these letters of Christ's apostles ought to make a part of their sacred anagnosis?

It must also be observed that the greater part of the books of the

[1] Leonard Hug, Einleitung, &c., i., 108. Stuttgard.
[2] We have an instance in Tacitus, De Oratoribus, c. 7.
[3] 1 Thess. v. 27. See Propp. 16, 17.
[4] Which is believed to be the Epistle to the Ephesians. See Prop. 427.

New Testament were addressed, not to individuals, but to public men, or to particular churches, or to all the Christian churches in general.

158. We are able also to point out in our Scriptures, as Dr Thiersch has done, many expressions which allude to the anagnosis as a fact already fixed in the habits of the worship of the age. They shew us that the apostles, without giving orders that were superfluous on this point, since the usage was universal, speak as if expecting that their books would be publicly read in Christian assemblies. To this usage the words at the beginning of the Apocalypse[1] seem to refer: "Blessed is *he that readeth*," (the word here is singular, Dr Thiersch remarks, as if designating the public reader,) "and *they that hear* the words of this prophecy," (here the verb is plural, as designating his hearers.) Why, asks Dr Thiersch, this difference, if there is not an allusion to the anagnosis? To this usage the seven-times-repeated call[2] in the same book refers: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit *saith unto the churches*." The book, then, is for the churches. To this usage the words in the Gospel of John[3] refer, which very clearly shew that the apostle in writing them had before his mind's eye the assemblies of the faithful and their sacred readings: "But these are written that ye might believe;" and again in chap. xix., "that ye might believe." To this usage the words refer in the Epistle to the Colossians,[4] addressed to Archippus, and connected immediately by the copulative with the injunction he had given them to read this epistle in the church: "And that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea; and say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it." "In this position," Dr Thiersch again remarks,[5] "these words appear to be addressed to Archippus as the person who directed the readings in public worship, and they are an exhortation to acquit himself with care in this important office."

159. But what quotation from Scripture is comparable as a recognition of the anagnosis to that famous passage of Peter (2 Pet. iii. 16) where the writer mentions *all the epistles of Paul*, and

[1] Apoc. i. 3.
[2] Apoc. ii. 7, 11, 17, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22.
[3] John xx. 31, and also xix. 35.
[4] Col. iv. 17.
[5] Versuch, &c., p. 349.

complains of their abuse by many "unlearned and unstable" persons. We see clearly in this passage, (1.) that the author addressed himself to the general body of Christian assemblies; (2.) that already in his time Paul *had written* to these assemblies, and that all the epistles then known were read among them; for the author mentions all, (πάσας,) without determining how many; (3.) that Paul had written them long enough for them to be known to all by the anagnosis; (4.) that if many members of these churches misunderstood and wrested them to their own destruction, yet it was always a matter received by them, as well as the judgment of the author, *that all these epistles of Paul* ought to hold among them the same rank as all the other writings of the Old Testament (ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς) which had been read for ages in all the assemblies of God's people.

It is scarcely possible to imagine more positive testimony, taking this epistle simply as a document of the first century, and without regard to its author; for we shall elsewhere prove its priority to the Epistle of Jude;[1] and Thiersch, quoting it as we have done, and for the same object, takes care to add, "And let no one object that he rejects the canonicity of this epistle. What does it signify, since we can compel the most incredulous criticism not to place this writing later than the appearance of the Gnostic sect, that is, in the second part of the apostolic age?"

Thus, then, this epistle, even for those who refuse to ascribe it to the apostle Peter, its professed author, is an irrefragable memorial of the anagnosis in the first age of the Church.

160. Moreover, if we study the first Christians, in their habits and languages, we shall recognise a people among whom the public use of the Scriptures had long prevailed. For example, the frequent mention of the *anagnostae*,[2] or readers, who held a higher rank than the deacons.[3] For example, the use in the East among all the Christian congregations, even the poorest, to keep in their places of worship a collection of the sacred books.[4] For example, also, the mention of persons (even the blind) entirely uneducated,

[1] Book IV., Chap. III., V.

[2] Cyprian, Epistles 24, 33, 34, 29, 38, (others 33.) Bingham's Antiquities, ii., 27.

[3] "Hodie Diaconus qui cras Lector."—*Tertull., De Præscript.*, 41.

[4] Scholz, Prolegomena to his Critical Edition of the New Testament.

who, like John the Martyr, of Palestine, had learnt the Scriptures by heart, by the simple means of constantly attending the offices of public worship.[1] For example, equally, the fact that these simple members corrected the *anagnostes* if he happened to say one word for another.[2] For example, again, those translators who were retained in their assemblies for those of the hearers who did not understand the language of the *anagnostes:* as in Syria for those who did not know Greek, or for those who did not know Aramaic; and as in Africa, for those who only spoke the Punic language, or the Latin.[3] And for example, lastly, the usage, kept up till the time of Tertullian,[4] in the churches founded by the apostles, of guarding with veneration the autographs of the epistles they had received from these men of God. This appears to be the meaning of the language of this father, when he says, "Go through the apostolic churches, where the very chairs of the apostles are still preserved in the same places, and where their authentic epistles are recited."[5]

161. But the testimony of Justin Martyr, thirty-six years only after the death of St John, will, perhaps, better satisfy some minds as to the high antiquity of the *anagnosis* of the New Testament. This distinguished man belonged to Palestine by his birth, to Egypt by his studies, to Asia Minor by his travels, and to the church of Italy by his long residence in Rome, as the head of a school of Christianity. He was converted from the Pagan philosophy to the Christian faith in 133; it is in his famous Apology, presented to Antoninus Pius, (in the year 139,) that he

[1] Eusebius, De Martyr. Palest., cap. xiii.

[2] Bingham, vii., 3, 17, xiii., 4, 10.—We may cite as a continuation of habits thus formed, and as a specimen of the scrupulous attention which would not allow the slightest change in the sacred text, the zeal with which Spiridion opposed Triphilus when, in a discourse delivered before several bishops, he substituted for a phrase in the Gospel one that he believed more elegant.—*Sozomen*, Hist., xi., 1. We may also cite with St Augustine (Epist. 71 and 85) the excitement occasioned in the African Church by the change of a single word, which yet was of no importance as to faith or practice. The faithful demanded a reason from their bishop, and obliged him to repair the scandal by a serious apology. We see from all these incidents how familiar the text of Scripture was to Christians of the first ages.

[3] Bingham, xiii., 4, 5, iii., 13, 4.

[4] De Præscrip. Hæretic., cap. xxx., p. 212.

[5] "Percurre ecclesias apostolicas apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident," (or præsidentur.)

speaks of the *anagnosis*.[1] His defence of primitive Christianity is the most ancient that has been handed down to us; and what renders it particularly valuable on the question now before us is not only its high antiquity, together with his eminently public, and, so to speak, official character; it is the fact that monuments of this epoch, whether of profane or ecclesiastical history, are of extraordinary rarity. The epoch of the death of the last apostles, like that of the reigns of Nerva and Trajan,[2] is historically very obscure,[3] although immediately preceded, and soon followed by times abundantly illustrated, whether by the annals of the Church, or those of the empire. As to documents, which can make us acquainted with the practices of the first Christians in their public worship, we are reduced to the greatest destitution. Starting from the year 53, when Paul describes what took place in the Corinthian Church,[4] down to the year 217, when Tertullian lays before us the forms of worship in his age, we can find in the archives of human knowledge but two other descriptions of the Christian assemblies of these remote days. And yet the first is only that of a Pagan, the proconsul Pliny;[5] whilst the other is that of Justin Martyr, thirty-two years after Pliny.

The following is the testimony of Justin; and we may observe that, if he describes the public worship of the Christians of his age, it is not for the purpose of transmitting the knowledge of it to future generations; it is only to demonstrate their innocence to their persecutors, and particularly to the Emperor Antoninus:—

"On the day called Sunday," he says, "there is a gathering[6] to the same place of all who live either in the towns or country, and then *the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets*[7]

[1] In chap. lxvii. This is the largest and the first, though generally printed after the other, which was composed twenty-four years later, and presented to the Roman senate under the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

[2] From the year 96 to the year 117.

[3] The great number of eminent historians of this epoch, so brilliant in the annals of Rome, has not prevented this strange obscurity; the greater part have perished, and the glorious reign of Trajan is scarcely to be studied except in the letters of Pliny, in medals, and in the abridgment which is left us of Dion.

[4] 1 Cor. xi., xiv.

[5] Book I., Chap. IV. See Prop. 140.

[6] Συνέλευσις γίνεται.

[7] Καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγγωρεῖ.

are read as long as the time allows. Then, when the reader has finished, the president, by an address, makes an exhortation and an appeal to prompt to an imitation of these noble examples." [1]

Nothing can be more decisive than this short description, to shew us the rank and high place which the reading of the apostles and prophets already held in their religious meetings, only thirty-six years after the death of St John.

We may here also recognise at a glance the perfect resemblance of this primitive worship to that of the synagogue; for, in reading Justin Martyr, we might suppose we were present with Paul and Barnabas at that assembly in Pisidia, so well described by St Luke seventy-five years before: "They went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down. And *after the reading of the law and the prophets,*" (or, as Justin says, "the *anagnostes* having finished,") "the rulers of the synagogue" (the προεστῶτες of Justin) "sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on," (εἰ ἔστι λόγος ἐν ὑμῖν παρακλήσεως.) (It is the διὰ λόγου of Justin.)

162. Many efforts have been made of late in Germany to evade the irresistible force of this testimony of Justin. Some have endeavoured to see in these *Memoirs of the Apostles* only apocryphal Gospels; but Hug, Winer, Biedermann, Otto, and others, have treated this curious evasion as it deserves. Others would recognise in it only the four Gospels, to the exclusion of the other books of the New Testament; but Credner [2] and Thiersch [3] have had no difficulty in shewing, by apt quotations from Irenæus, (lib. ii., cap. 27,) and the Apostolic Constitutions, (lib. ii., cap. 59,) that by such expressions Justin evidently intended the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament.

163. We, therefore, once more infer that this great fact of the regular and public reading of the New Testament is an institution as old as the Church itself; that it explains the perfect unanimity (which without it is inexplicable) of all the churches on the subject of the twenty-two *homologoumena;* that, joined to this

[1] Διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται.

[2] Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften, i., p. 60. (1832.)—Credner speaks only of Irenæus.

[3] In the work quoted above, vi., 350.

unanimity, it will be an irrefragable proof of the authenticity of these holy books; and that it renders impossible the intrusion of an illegitimate book into the sacred canon after the death of the apostles,—impossible that such an intrusion could succeed in being admitted into all the churches on the face of the earth,—impossible, above all, that it could take place without exciting innumerable protests,—impossible, lastly, that if these protests had been made, the report of them should not have come down to us.

But we pass on to the monuments of the canon—that is to say, the traces it has left in the literature of the first ages.

CHAPTER IV.

THE VARIOUS MONUMENTS OF THE CANON.

SECTION FIRST.

FOUR CLASSES OF MONUMENTS.

164. WHATEVER may be the force of the arguments presented in the foregoing chapters, we are asked for new proofs taken from the authors of the primitive Church, and sometimes we hear complaints of the alleged insufficiency of the testimonials which its literature renders to the first canon. We proceed, then, to bring forward these testimonials.

The monuments which the canon has left us of its œcumenical use and its authority are of four or five classes.

First of all, the versions which, at an early period, were made of the New Testament into different languages, particularly the Latin and Syriac. But we think that enough has been said already on this subject in our First Book.[1]

In the second place, the writings, not very numerous, but quite sufficient, of the second century. We arrange the Christian authors, whose writings have come down to us, in two divisions: first those of the second half of the century, and then those of the first.

In the third place, the numerous and involuntary testimonies which the ancient enemies of the truth bear to the New Testament: that is to say, on the one hand the unbelievers of the second century who attacked Christianity; and on the other, the heretics who during the same period harassed the Church.

[1] See Propositions 31, 32, 33, and 34.

Fourthly and lastly, the apostolic fathers, and even the later writings of the New Testament.

But to proceed in this review with the greater clearness, and to avoid superfluous quotations, we must first assign limits to the field of our researches.

SECTION SECOND.

THE FIELD OF RESEARCH.

165. This field must not extend beyond the first and second century. In fact, it would be useless to go further; since the Rationalists who are the most determined against the authority of our sacred books acknowledge that, from the days of Origen, or the beginning of the third century, everything had been settled in the Church on this great question. Even the too celebrated Strauss[1] grants that "in the times of this father our sacred books were universally acknowledged as proceeding from the apostles, or the companions of the apostles." What our opponents still dispute is, the anterior testimony, the voice of the second century, and that of the first. So that, to establish our proofs by the literature of the Church, we have only to pass it under review through successive years in reverse order, taking our point of departure from the last days of Septimius Severus, about the year 203, and backwards till we reach the end of St John's ministry, in 103, or rather about the end of Paul's ministry and the reign of Nero, in 68. Between these two termini, over the only interval where our opponents profess not to be satisfied, we shall proceed to cast a bridge firmly suspended on a triple chain of testimonies. We set out from the year 203, when the great Origen, after witnessing the martyrdom of his father, began, at the age of eighteen, his career of teaching in Alexandria, and we stop about the year 103, when John, full of days, finished his life at Ephesus; or, perhaps better, towards the year 68, when Peter and Paul ended their course at Rome, very soon after having written, as we think, the one his second epistle, and the other, his Epistle to the Hebrews. In other words, we follow the traces of our holy books from the last days of Septimius Severus to the last days of Nero. Our

[1] Life of Jesus, part i., p. 74.

opponents allege that they have been lost between the opposite banks; it is our business to exhibit them—a task which has often been performed by others under different forms. For, after all, the history of the Church, notwithstanding the paucity of its literature at this epoch can supply us with abundant materials for placing between these two heights the three strong chains of which we spoke just now, with which to construct a safe passage from one side to the other.

166. In order to give their true meaning and just value to these historical monuments, we must not forget that the labour of studying them ought constantly to be pursued, while at the same time carefully taking cognisance of the contemporary Church in its interior life, its totality, and its character. Dr Thiersch, among the German writers, has clearly shewn the importance of this rule, and the aberrations of the men who have neglected it.

167. To render more palpable to the minds of our readers the persons and dates of this important epoch, we think it will be of use to present in a synoptic Table the series of the only witnesses that can be produced in this investigation. For this purpose, we set down in the order of time, opposite the series of emperors, (i.) that of the fathers who have left authentic writings in the first and second centuries; (ii.) that of the heretics who, while disputing the truths of Holy Writ, have yet borne testimony by their very attacks to the sacred canon; (iii.) that of the enemies of Christianity, who in the same period have assailed it while acknowledging it was founded on our sacred books; (iv.) that of the great persecutions which the Church underwent; and lastly, (v.) that of apologists who publicly defended it.[1]

168. We hope that this chronological table of emperors, fathers, adversaries, and heretics, will shed a useful light upon the discussion that will follow it, by reducing its elements to the most precise terms, and by shewing their small number and their correspondency. We have omitted in the column of the *emperors* those whose reign did not last above a year; in the column of *heresies* those who have left no traces, as the Ophites,[2] or those

[1] This is for greater distinctness, for perhaps we might more logically leave them in the series of the fathers.

[2] Four sects which Hippolytus assigns to the days of St John.

who, though sound as to the doctrine of God and Christ, were not so in point of discipline,[1] (as the *Montanists*[2] and *Quatuordecimanians*;[3]) and lastly, in the column of the *fathers*, on the one hand, those whose works are lost or who have left but a few short fragments preserved in Eusebius, or elsewhere—as *Papias*,[4] *Hegesippus*,[5] *Pantaenus*,[6] *Melito*,[7] *Dionysius of Corinth*,[8] *Asterius Urbanus*,[9]—and on the other hand, those whose pretended writings are decidedly rejected by the most esteemed critics.[10]

[1] See in Bunsen's Hippolytus, i., 231, the thirty-two sects which that father reckoned in his time.

[2] Or Cataphrygians, about the year 161.

[3] In the dispute about Easter, in the second and third century.

[4] Bishop of Hierapolis in 118. He had been a hearer (ἀκουστής) of St John. Irenæus tells us he was a friend (ἑταῖρος) of Polycarp. He adds, that he wrote five books. Eusebius, H. E., iii., 39.

[5] The most ancient ecclesiastical historian. He lived from the year 100 to 170, having travelled much to see all the apostolic men, and to prepare his history, of which Eusebius and Photius have preserved some fragments.

[6] Head of the Alexandrian school about 179.

[7] Bishop of Sardis about the year 170.

[8] Bishop of Corinth about the same time.

[9] Bishop of Galatia about the year 186.

[10] See Hefele, (Patr. Apostol. Opera,) Proleg., p. 9, 80.

Section Third.

THE ACTORS AND WITNESSES OF THE TWO FIRST CENTURIES OF THE CHURCH, SETTING OUT FROM THE DEATH OF ST PAUL.

Emperors of Rome.	Fathers of whom Authentic Works are Extant.	Enemies of the Church.	Persecutions.	Apologist Fathers.
1st CENTURY.	1st CENTURY.	1st CENTURY.	1st CENTURY.	1st CENTURY.
Nero, 54-68.	James was dead in 61; Paul and Peter between 64 and 68; Jude much later; John only in 103.	From the apostolic times, besides the *Nicolaitans*, (Rev. ii. 6,) the *Balaamites*, (ver. 14,) the disciples of Simon, (Acts viii. 18,) and of Menander, (Iren. Hæres., i. 21,) those of Phygellus and Hermogenes, (2 Tim. i. 15, ii. 17,) of Hymenæus and Philetus,—all sects of whom there remains nothing, and of whom we shall not speak,—the Church was harassed, from the days of John, by two numerous sects of heretics, the *Ebionites* and	The *first*, under Nero, from 64 to 68.	
Vespasian, 69-79.	Clement, the companion, it is believed, of Paul, (Phil. iv. 3,) and bishop of Rome nine years, (from 91 to 101 according to Eusebius, from 68 to 77 according to Jerome,) has left one beautiful *epistle to the Corinthians*.			
Titus, 79-81.				

DOMITIAN, 81–96.	IGNATIUS, a hearer of the apostle John, bishop of Antioch in 68, martyr in 107, (others say in 116,) has left seven authentic epistles according to some, three according to others, (to the Romans, to the Ephesians, and to Polycarp,) and we have a contemporary account of his martyrdom.	The *Ebionites* comprised various Judaising sects, who denied the divinity of Jesus Christ. The Fathers attributed the name, some to the Hebrew epithet *Ebion*, (poor,) which they had taken or had been given to them; others to the proper name of an unknown leader, whom Lardner believes to have been a disciple of CERINTHUS.	The *second*, under DOMITIAN, from 93 to 96.	
NERVA, 96–98.	*Letter to Diognetus.*—The author unknown; calls himself a disciple of the apostles, (xi.) It is very beautiful, and very probably was written before the year 70. Yet others refer it to the reign of Trajan.	The *Gnostics*, or men of *Gnosis*, (science "falsely so called," St Paul says, 1 Tim. vi. 20,) were almost all *Docetæ* or *Phantasiasts*, (*i. e.*, pretending that Christ did not assume a real body, and suffered only in appearance.) They considered revelation insufficient, mixed their philosophy with it, and pretended to possess alone the true *Gnosis*, (science,) either by direct and immediate intuition, or by a tradition going back to the creation.		
TRAJAN, 98–100.	POLYCARP. Born in 71, suffered martyrdom in 166; had known St John. He has left one epistle to the Philippians; and we have a beautiful circular epistle of the church at Smyrna, giving an account of his martyrdom to the contemporary churches.	CERINTHUS, a Jewish philosopher, after having studied in Egypt, betook himself to Asia Minor, where he impugned the divinity of Jesus Christ, being in that respect an Ebionite. According to Irenæus, John wrote the introduction of his Gospel to refute him.		
TACITUS, PLINY, PLUTARCH, and SUETONIUS were living writers.				

Emperors of Rome.	Fathers of whom Authentic Works are Extant.	Enemies of the Church.	Persecutions.	Apologist Fathers.
2D CENTURY.	2D CENTURY.	2D CENTURY.	2D CENTURY.	2D CENTURY.
TRAJAN, (*continued,*) 100-117.	JUSTIN MARTYR, born in Samaria, at Shechem, about the year 103, a philosopher, converted in 133, came (at the beginning of the reign of Antoninus) to Rome, though he did not suffer martyrdom till 167, under Marcus Aurelius. We have his *Two Apologies*, a treatise on the *Monarchy of God*, and a *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. He composed other works, such as an *Exposition of the Apocalypse*, which are now lost.	GNOSTICS. BASILIDES of Alexandria, a disciple of Menander, was one of the principal. Born in the 1st century, and died in 130; he taught his magical doctrine under Trajan and Hadrian. ISIDORE, his son, added other reveries, and formed a sect. CERDO came from Asia Minor to teach at Rome in 132, and was excommunicated by Pope Hyginus about 140.	The *third*, under TRAJAN, from 107 to 117; under HADRIAN, to 130.	
HADRIAN, 117-138.	THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch, born in 110, converted in 150, died in 170, has left an Apology for Christianity, and some other writings.	MARCION, born at Sinope, where his father was bishop; became a disciple of Basilides; taught at Alexandria in 117; wrote twenty-four books of commentaries on the Gospels, of which Clement and Epiphanius have preserved some fragments. He came to join Cerdo at Rome about 140; he was there as well as Valentine and Cerdo, in the time of Justin Martyr, under Antoninus Pius.		QUADRATUS, bishop of Athens, presented an Apology to Hadrian in 131. We have only a fragment of it in Eusebius.

ANTONINUS PIUS, 138–161.	IRENÆUS, born in Asia or Greece in the year 120, came into Gaul in 177, and was martyred (it is said) in 202. His principal work, *Against Heresies*, is in five books. Of all the ancient Fathers, one of the firmest and purest; he represents most faithfully the real beliefs of the Church.	VALENTINUS of Egypt came also to teach to Rome under Popes Hyginus and Anicetus, (from 139 to 157,) and ended his career in Cyprus. He imagined thirty æons, or inferior gods. He sent out numerous disciples, who formed themselves into a sect: among others Colobarsa; Ptolemy in 140; Heracleon, Tatian, who at least adopted his æons; Bardesanes the Syrian, who lived at Edessa in 172, and who ended in opposing him. He wrote much and ably.		ARISTIDES, the same, 175. He was a converted philosopher. JUSTIN MARTYR presented two, which we still have—one to Antoninus in 139, the other to Marcus Aurelius in 163.
MARCUS AURELIUS, 161–180.	ATHENAGORAS, a Platonic philosopher born at Athens; he became a Christian; fixed himself at Alexandria; addressed an Apology for Christianity to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus. We also have a treatise of his on the Resurrection.	CARPOCRATES of Egypt, and his son EPIPHANIUS. He taught under Hadrian a mystic and licentious Antinomianism. TATIAN, born in Mesopotamia, at first an orator and Pagan philosopher, came to Rome, and was converted to the profession of Christianity. Having heard Justin Martyr, he became his disciple for a long time, and composed a *Discourse against the Greeks*, and died in 178. But he fell into the Gnostic errors, and in the East put himself at the head of the sect of the Encratites. Besides many other writings, he composed a Harmony of the Four Evangelists, which was extant in the time of Eusebius. He is believed to have made a Latin translation of the Apocrypha.	The *fourth*, under MARCUS AURELIUS, from 160, because the Christians would not take part in the solemnities of his triumph.	THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch, also presented one at the same time. APOLLINARIS, bishop of Hierapolis, the same, during the persecution of Marcus Aurelius in 169.
COMMODUS, 180–193.	CLEMENT of Alexandria, a converted Platonic philosopher; born about the year 150, and died in 217. His writings are numerous, (*Stromata*, *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, &c.) Jerome and Theoderet estimate him highly for his knowledge and genius.			MELITO, bishop of Sardis, presented an Apology in 172. This also is lost.

Emperors of Rome.	Fathers of whom Authentic Works are Extant.	Enemies of the Church.	Persecutions.	Apologist Fathers.
2D CENTURY. —(*continued.*)	2D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	2D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	2D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	2D CENTURY— (*continued.*)
SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, 193–200.	TERTULLIAN, (the most ancient of the Latin Fathers;) born at Carthage in 160, converted from Paganism about 185. He afterwards repaired to Rome; but, dissatisfied with the Roman clergy, he returned to Africa, where he embraced Montanist views on Church-discipline. He died about the year 220. We have a great number of his writings, (*Apologeticus, Five Books against Marcion,* &c.)	EBIONITE-GNOSTIC SECTS. THEODOTUS, a tanner of Byzantium, came to Rome in 192, where he was excommunicated by Victor in 194. He said that Jesus Christ was created by the Father, but before the creation of the world. ARTEMON, his disciple, who has been accused of expunging the passage in 1 John v. 7. PAGAN OPPONENTS OF CHRISTIANITY. CELSUS, (*Kelsos,*) an Epicurean philosopher under Trajan and his successors. A violent enemy of Christianity, he assailed it with the weapons of argument and ridicule in his *Logos Alethes,* of which nothing remains but the fragments preserved in Origen's *Refutation.*	The *fifth*, under SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, from 202, throughout the Empire.	TATIAN, before his defection, composed a *Discourse against the Greeks.* ATHENAGORAS, a philosopher of Athens, taught at Alexandria in 177. Presented an Apology to Marcus Aurelius, entitled, *A Deputation concerning the Christians;* he wrote a treatise on the Resurrection, which is also apologetical. They are still extant.

		LUCIAN of Samosata, born about 120, wrote satiric dialogues in which he attacked Christianity. He dedicated his *False Prophet* to Celsus.		
3D CENTURY.	3D CENTURY.	3D CENTURY.	3D CENTURY.	3D CENTURY.
SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, (*continued,*) 200-211. CARACALLA, 211-217.	ORIGEN, born at Alexandria in 185, witnessed his father's martyrdom in 202, succeeded Clement of Alexandria in his school, travelled much, accomplished immense labours, and died in 253.	MANES, born in Persia, founder of *Manichaeism*, which he borrowed in part from Zoroaster. It is said he was flayed alive in Persia in 271.		AMMONIUS SACCAS, (or *Saccophorus,*) a philosopher, founder of Eclecticism, composed, at the beginning of the century, a work on the agreement of Moses and Jesus Christ. It is entirely lost.
HELIOGABALUS, 218-222. ALEXANDER SEVERUS, 222-235.	HIPPOLYTUS, at first bishop in Arabia, (according to Eusebius,) an intimate friend of Origen, a distinguished Greek theologian, historian, and mathematician, came afterwards to Italy about the year 222, and suffered martyrdom about 235 or 240.	PORPHYRY, (*Malchus,*) a neo-platonic philosopher, born at Tyre in 233, educated at Athens under Longinus and Plotinus, and a mystic philosopher at Rome, where he died in 304. He composed fifteen books against the Christians. Theodosius burnt them, but there are fragments in Eusebius and Jerome. In the first book he has collected the apparent contradictions of Scripture; in the fourth he attacked Moses; in the thirteenth Daniel.		
MAXIMIN, 235-237.	JULIUS AFRICANUS, Greek historian and chronologist, converted to Christianity about the year 231. A friend of Origen. He wrote a Commentary on the New Testament, of which we have only fragments in Eusebius.		The *sixth*, under MAXIMIN, in 235. The *seventh*, under DECIUS, from 250 to 253.	TERTULLIAN wrote his beautiful *Apologeticus* in Latin, in 202.

Emperors of Rome.	Fathers of whom Authentic Works are Extant.	Enemies of the Church.	Persecutions.	Apologist Fathers.
3D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	3D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	3D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	3D CENTURY— (*continued.*)	3D CENTURY— (*continued.*)
GORDIAN, 237–244.	DIONYSIUS of Alexandria, bishop in 232, died in 247. His numerous writings are lost; but Eusebius often quotes from them.	AMELIUS, a Tuscan, a disciple of Plotinus from 246; did not leave him till 270, when he went to live at Assamea. Like Porphyry, he was an enemy of Christianity.	The *eighth*, under VALERIAN, in 257.	MINUTIUS FELIX, an African orator, wrote his Apology at Rome in 220, in the form of a dialogue, entitled *Octavius*. It is still extant.
PHILIP, 244–249.	CAIUS, presbyter of Rome in 210. There are only fragments of his writings in Eusebius.		The *ninth*, under AURELIAN, from 272 to 275.	
DECIUS, 249–251.	CYPRIAN, born at Carthage in 202, bishop in 248, died in 258. His works, which are in Latin, (*sole clariora*, says Jerome,) form a large volume.		The *tenth*, in the fourth century, from the year 303, throughout the Empire.	

N.B.—Observe, that though in this Table we have endeavoured to arrange everything correctly as far as relates to the heretics of the second century, we must acknowledge that (as Cave and other historians complain) their chronology presents great confusion.

169. To render the review of all these monuments of antiquity more clear and striking, we begin with the latest; and thus going back in the order of time, we first of all listen to the least ancient fathers before we reach those of the first half of the second century; from these again, we proceed to the fathers of the first century, then to the apostolic fathers, and lastly, to those apostles who wrote the last books of the New Testament.

CHAPTER V.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

SECTION FIRST.

THE UNITED TESTIMONIES OF IRENÆUS, CLEMENT, AND TERTULLIAN.

170. IF we place ourselves at the entrance of the third century, in the year 202, when the terrible persecution of Septimius Severus was raging throughout the whole extent of the empire, and young Origen, who had just seen his father Leonides beheaded, was beginning at Alexandria his long and splendid career, we shall find, on the theatre of the world, three brilliant lights occupying high positions, and for a long period illuminating the Church. These were Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. While Origen had already devoted himself to those immense biblical researches which, with all his errors, will ever endear his name to the Churches of God, these three great men commanded the attention of all Christians for a long series of years, and their writings were circulated through every part of the Roman Empire. Like three lighthouses, erected at great distances from each other, their beams were seen from afar: Irenæus, beyond the Alps, in the distant metropolis of Gaul, where they spoke Greek, Latin, and Celtic; Clement in Alexandria, that seat of learning where Coptic and Greek were spoken; and, lastly, Tertullian at Carthage, the metropolis of proconsular Africa, where they spoke Latin and the Punic language. For a length of time the voices of these three men were heard. Irenæus, an octagenarian and more, for a quarter of a century,

fed the flock of Christ at Lyons, and was destined to end his long career by martyrdom in the year 202.[1] Clement, aged fifty-two, did not die before 217; and the great Tertullian, the most ancient of the Latin fathers, then in his forty-second year, but converted seventeen years before, and presbyter of Carthage for ten years, exerted in Africa, as throughout the Latin Church, a long and beneficial influence. We know the respect afterwards paid to his memory, in this very Carthage, by the bishop and martyr Cyprian. "What Origen was for the Greeks, that is to say, the first of all," said the famous Vincentius of Lerins,[2] (two hundred years after Cyprian,) "Tertullian has been for the Latins, that is to say, incontestably the first among us," (*nostrorum omnium facile princeps.*) "Who has been more learned than this man, and who has had greater experience both in Divine and human things?"

171. It would be impossible to imagine for the second half of the second century three men more competent to bear witness to the prevailing belief respecting the Scriptures. Everything recommends them to our confidence on this point: their character, their erudition, their labours, their travels, the esteem in which they were universally held, and all the sacrifices they had made for these holy writings. Besides, if we select them as the representatives of the second half of the second century, their testimony (especially that of Irenæus) goes back, by the circumstances of their life, much higher than the time when they began their ministry. It reaches almost to the times of the apostles. Every one is acquainted with that famous epistle of Irenæus to Florinus,[3] in which he tells of having passed his early youth in intimacy with Polycarp, who himself had been, he says, a hearer of St John, and who had repeated to him his pious recollections, "wholly conformable to the Holy Scriptures," he is careful to add. Moreover, what gives the greatest weight to the testimony of these three men is, that their writings still remaining are very extensive. Those of Irenæus (Grabe's edition) make a folio volume of about five hundred pages; the best edition of Tertullian (that of Venice, 1746) is also a large folio; and the best of Clement of Alexandria (in Greek, with a

[1] This martyrdom is, however, not perfectly certain.

[2] Edit. of Baluze. 1663. P. 323.

[3] Hist. Eccles., i., 5, cap. 19, 20. Iren., Adv. Hæres., iii., 3.

Latin translation) makes two folio volumes. Moreover, these three witnesses, particularly Clement and Tertullian, were converted from the pagan doctrine to the profession of the gospel simply through recognising the power of the testimonies rendered to our sacred books, and finding in all the contemporaneous churches a common, constant, and undisputed conviction respecting them. They had before their eyes decisive reasons for abjuring their ancient errors, and for believing in the Divine origin of the Scriptures. All three, trained from their youth to critical investigations, had all the means of ascertaining the certainty of those books which became henceforward the rule of their life. All three had travelled in Asia, Greece, and Italy; they were acquainted with men of every land who represented the knowledge of their times. They were, besides, very near the original sources, being almost contemporaries of the immediate successors of the apostles; so that, when they owned the authority of the Scriptures, which had been already received as Divine in all the churches, they possessed, in order to receive this faith everywhere persecuted, all the means, as well as all the motives, for ascertaining the legitimate supremacy which those books had acquired in all Christian societies.

172. Do we wish, then, to hear the voice of the second century, and to know its opinion, as expressed at the time, of the sacred Scriptures? Let us open one of the important writings of these three great teachers, and say if it be possible to imagine testimony more abundant, either of their personal conviction, or of the universal belief which prevailed in their times, in all the Churches of the East and of the West. We shall experience, it must be confessed, some embarrassment in giving an account of this testimony, from its very abundance. It seems to us that the attempt to demonstrate it by quotations is to ignore and weaken it, and all we can say of it will always be far below the impression that would be made by the simple reading of these works. Let a person occupy himself with them only for a single day, and the impression he will receive will be far deeper than any words of ours can make. He will find himself borne along, so to speak, on the full current of the Scriptures—he will be transported into the midst of a generation which lived in the light of the New Testament—he will hear the men of that generation appealing to our

sacred books in order to establish a truth, just as for any object of sight we should make use of the light of the sun. All their pages shew them to us, constantly depending on the oracles of God as the only foundation of their faith and the faith of every one; they are only ministers of this word; they quote it as their rule, because it is the universal standard, and for any one to oppose it is, they say, "to avow himself a heretic—it is to forsake the Church,"—for the whole Church follows its rule as one man. This word is for them the supreme law by which every heresy, past, present, and future, is to be judged, as it will judge hereafter the living and the dead. We do not think it possible to cite an author among the moderns who has appealed in his writings more frequently, and with a more absolute deference, to the infallible authority of this holy word. Not only the bulky volumes of these three men are throughout penetrated with it—not only are they a tapestry in which the passages of Scripture constantly recur like a thread of gold along the warp to strengthen and adorn the texture; but you at once perceive that such language could not be employed except in a generation that had long been submissive to the written word, and accustomed to bow, as one man, to its authority.[1]

But before we give a specimen of their testimony by some quotation, we believe it will be convenient to exhibit six or seven general traits which distinguish it.

Section Second.

SEVEN CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR TESTIMONY.

173. In the first place, these fathers do not confine themselves to making citations continually from the twenty books which compose our first canon. They speak very frequently of the assemblage of these books as forming a whole—a book—a New Testament—which the Church of their times had fully received—which it had joined to the sacred oracles of the old covenant, and called indiffer-

[1] The most striking passages of the fathers on each of the books of the canon may be found in great number in the valuable collection of Kirchhofer in his work, entitled, Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus. Zurich, 1842. See especially pp. 17–29.

ently the SCRIPTURE, or the SCRIPTURES, the NEW DEED, the NEW TESTAMENT, the DOMINICAL SCRIPTURES, (*τὰς κυριακὰς γραφάς*, *Dominicas Scripturas*,) the DIVINE SCRIPTURES, (*τὰς θείας γραφάς*,) THE GOSPEL, and THE APOSTLE. For these fathers alike regard all the epistles as forming in their turn a single book which they call THE APOSTLE, and the four Gospels as forming *a single Tetramorphous Gospel*, (or Gospel under four forms,) to which they joined the Acts of the Apostles.

(2.) Another trait of their testimony is, that they habitually associate the Old Testament and the New as one series of sacred books, having the same origin, and equal authority.

(3.) A third is, that they declare their inviolable faith in the Divine and complete inspiration of all these scriptures; they put them on a level with the other prophets; they distinguish them from every other book which is not inspired, and from every pretended tradition which is not conformed to them; they call them "the oracles of God," "the foundation and pillar of faith," "the rule of truth," "the theopneustic Scriptures," (*τὰς θεοπνεύστους γραφάς*,) "the perfect Scriptures," "the Scriptures uttered by the Word of God and by His Spirit;" and they declare of the sacred writers, that they were all *pneumatophori*, (bearers of the Holy Spirit,) and that they all spoke by one and the same Spirit of God.

(4.) Further, they professed this perfect faith in the Divine inspiration of all these books while associating themselves with the whole Church; they represent it as the common faith held by all the Christians in the world; they declare that for any one to set himself against this oecumenical rule of Truth, is in the opinion of all to belong no more to the Christian Church—it is to go out of it, (*exeuntes;*) because not the least discordancy of sentiment exists on this point in any contemporary church.

(5.) Such, in this respect, is their calm and confident persuasion —such is the peaceable universality of this conviction among the Christians of their time—that you never find them occupied in defending it. And why should they? It was everywhere firmly settled; it was in all the consciences of those who profess the truth; it was not disputed by any party in the Church in the second century, and you cannot hear against any of the twenty books of the canon one of those objections which biblical criticism multi-

plies in our day. They hold them for a universal and undisputed code. When they bring forward a passage to establish any disputed truth, it is just like bringing a light into a dark place to shew an unknown object distinctly. You may differ about the object, but not about the light, which is the same for all. The Scriptures are the light. This common confidence is taken for granted in the second century; they never demonstrate it. If I were speaking of the Rhone in Geneva, should I stay to prove that it passes through that city, and that we find water there? Why, then, should these three teachers demonstrate to the men of their day that the river of the Scripture flowed through the city of God, and that they found there the living waters of grace in abundance? They never did it. In all their folios, they discuss the biblical *meaning* of this or that expression, but never its *Divine authority;* they profess themselves interpreters of the New Testament, but never its defenders. What object could they have in defending it? No one in the Church attacked it, and if you wish to meet with despisers of the Word, you must go forth and search for them in the Roman schools of Cerdo, Marcion, or Valentinus.[1]

(6.) A sixth trait is, that, in religion, everything is decided for them, and everything must be decided for the whole Church as soon as it clearly understood what the Scripture has said. "The Scriptures," they say, "are a perfect revelation of the Christian faith;" "their teaching is fully sufficient," (*scripturarum tractatio plenissima,*) "admitting neither retrenchment nor addition." "I adore," was their language, "the plenitude of the Scriptures." "A person," they add, "teaches nothing, if he cannot say of what he teaches, IT IS WRITTEN." Let not any one allege tradition; for them there was nothing that could stand against the declarations of the written word.

(7.) Lastly, listen to them. "It is to the Scriptures all must always appeal in order to explain the Scriptures, (*ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν,*) if we wish to arrive at the truth in a convincing manner, (*ἀποδεικτικῶς.*)"[2]

[1] These three leaders of three heretical sects, bearing respectively their names, taught in Rome during the second half of the second century.

[2] These different expressions will be met with later, and we shall point out the place.

Let us now hear nearer at hand these three great teachers of the second century, by quoting briefly from them in succession. It would be much easier to multiply these quotations than to select them, for they offer themselves in abundance in all their writings, and we might find even stronger; but we have first of all taken those which would best exemplify the six or seven traits we have just specified. We shall begin with the youngest, and then go back to his seniors—Tertullian, a presbyter of Carthage.

Section Third.

TERTULLIAN.

174. Although the youngest of these three teachers, Tertullian is the most ancient of the Latin fathers whose writings have come down to us. Born in paganism, only about fifty years after the death of St John, this eminent man, whose father was a centurion in the army of Africa, was educated according to the pagan philosophy, and in the study of jurisprudence. At the age of thirty-five, he was converted, by being an eye-witness of the punishment and Christian constancy of some martyrs. From that time he consecrated his genius and his talents to the gospel of Christ with all the disinterestedness of a determined heart. The unfair manner in which he believed himself treated by the clergy of Rome obliged him, about the year 207, to protest, by several writings, against the corruptions of the Church, and he soon fell into Montanism—a rigid sect, which seems to have erred especially in its excessive views of discipline, and in wishing to put the revelation of their prophets on a level with those of Scripture. Tertullian died about the year 220. His principal works are, his five books against Marcion, written, as he tells us himself, in the fifteenth year of Severus, in 207;[1] his admirable *Apologeticus*, about the year 217; his books against the Jews and Heretics; his treatises on Public Shows, on the Soul, on Monogamy, on the Crown of the Soldier, on the Pallium, on the Resurrection of the Flesh, &c.

175. Tertullian made constant use of the Scriptures; he dis-

[1] These dates are taken from a very able dissertation on Tertullian, from which an extract will be found at the head of his *Apologeticus*. (Giry's translation. Amster., 1712.) The imaginary dates of Pamelius and Baronius are there refuted.

tinctly quotes each of the twenty books of the first canon,[1] without forgetting even the very short Epistle to Philemon;[2] and we have already mentioned in reference to the innumerable testimonies that Tertullian bears to the canon, the words of the learned Lardner,[3] "that the quotations made by this father alone from the little volume of the New Testament are more extensive and more abundant than those from the works of Cicero by all the writers of all kinds and in all ages."

"How happy is that Church!" Tertullian exclaims, in his book *De Praescriptionibus Haereticorum*.[4] "It knows one God, Creator of all things, and Christ Jesus, Son of God the Creator, born of the Virgin Mary, and the resurrection of the flesh; it mixes the law and the prophets with the evangelic and apostolic writings, and from these it drinks in its faith." (*Legem et Prophetas cum Evangelicis et Apostolicis miscet; et inde potat fidem.*) In his treatise *De Monogamia*,[5] speaking of second marriages, and quoting a passage from the New Testament, (1 Cor. vii. 39,) he makes use of a Latin version, "which," he says, "we may plainly know is not so in the authentic Greek." (*Sciamus plane non sic esse in Graeco authentico.*)

The phrase *New Testament* for the collection of our sacred books was already received in his time; but the two collections had previously been called "*the one and the other instrument*," and Tertullian bears witness to the ancient usage, not only of having a collection of our scriptures, but of joining this new collection to the old.

In his fourth book, *Adversus Marcionem*, (chap. i.,) complaining of the heresy of this man, who attempted to establish an opposition between the God of the law and the God of the gospel, he calls the law and the gospel, "the one and the other instrument," (*alterum alterius instrumenti, vel quod magis usui est,*

[1] We speak here only of the first canon; about which we would say with Kirchhofer, (p. 263, Quellensammlung, Zurich, 1842,) that he cites equally all the canonical books of the New Testament, excepting (as this author says) only three allusions, more or less disputable, are found to the Epistle of James.

[2] Adv. Marcion., lib. v., cap. 42. [3] Prop. 122.

[4] Cap. xxxvi. Opera, ed. Leopold, Lips., 1841. Para. iii., p. 25.

[5] Cap. xi., p. 532 of the edition of Bale, 1515, ed. Leopold, Lips., 1841. Para. ii., p. 128.

Testamenti,[1]) or, as it is now more usually expressed, he says, "*the one and the other Testament.*" And in his book, *De Praescriptionibus*, he exclaims,[2] "If Marcion has separated the New Testament from the Old, (*Novum Testamentum a Vetere*,) he is later than that which he has separated, for he could separate only what had been united."

176. According to Tertullian, a dogma ought not to be preached if we cannot say of it, "*It is written.*" Woe, according to him, to those who add anything to, or retrench anything from, what is written. "To wish to believe without the Scriptures, (of the New Testament,) is to wish to believe against them."

In his treatise *Adversus Hermogenem*,[3] in speaking of a certain doctrine, he says, "Nothing is known about it, because the Scripture does not exhibit it." (*Nihil de eo constat quia Scriptura non exhibet.*) In the same manner, in his book *De Carne Christi*,[4] "They prove nothing, because *it is not written.*" (*Non probant quia nec scriptum est, nec, etc.*)

In his treatise *Adversus Praxean*[5]—"You ought to prove what you say," he says, "as plainly from the Scriptures as we prove that God made His own Word His Son." "Let us refer," he says, in his treatise *De Anima*, "these questions to the Scriptures of God"—("*revocando quaestiones ad Dei literas.*")[6]

In refuting an error of Hermogenes,[7] he says, "Let the heretics have to prove their doctrines by the Scriptures alone, and they will not be able to stand." (*De Scripturis solis quaestiones suas sistant et stare non poterunt.*)

In the same book, first speaking of all the Scriptures, and then contrasting the New Testament, a gospel, with the entire collection, he exclaims, "I adore the plenitude of Scripture, ... but in the Gospel I find more; I find the Word as the minister and

[1] He employs this term, the New Testament, many times elsewhere, to designate the canon. Thus *Ad. Praxean*, cap. xv., p. 508, ed. Rigalt. Paris, 1634. Pars. iv., p. 266, ed. Leopold, Lips., 1841.

[2] Cap. xxx., p. 212, ed. Paris, 1629. Pars. iii., p. 21, ed. Leopold, Lips., 1841.

[3] Cap. i., p 33, ed. Paris, 1664.

[4] Cap. vi., p. 312, Pars. iv., p. 6, ed. Leopold, Lips., 1841.

[5] Cap. xi., p. 505, Pars. iv., p. 259, ed. Leopold, Lips., 1841.

[6] Cap. ii., p. 265, Pars. iv., p. 171, ed. Leopold.

[7] Adv. Hermog., cap. xxii., p. 241.

mediator of the Maker." (*"In evangelio vero amplius et ministrum et arbitrum Factoris invenio sermonem."*) And as to this subject, (he goes on to say,) let the workshop of Hermogenes shew that "*it is written*;" but "if it is not written, let him fear the 'woe' appointed for those who add to or take from the Scriptures."[1] (*Si non est scriptum timeat "Væ illud" adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum.*)[2] And again, in his book *De Praescriptionibus*, indignant at the temerity of the heretics whom he was refuting, and holding for an axiom that "all faith ought to be founded on the Scriptures," he exclaims, "Well! let them believe without the Scriptures, since they will believe contrary to the Scriptures!" (*Sed credant sine Scripturis, ut credant adversus Scripturas.*)

And now, if from proconsular Africa we pass on to Egypt, we shall hear Clement of Alexandria delivering a perfectly similar testimony with equal copiousness.

Section Fourth.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

177. This father, though older than Tertullian, died three years before him, about the year 207. He himself, he says in the first book of his *Stromata*, "approached very near the days of the apostles." Born in paganism, and versed in all the science of the Greeks, he had for a long time professed their philosophy, when he was converted in Egypt by Pantænus, the pious and celebrated head of the Christian school at Alexandria. And when Pantænus left that city, about the year 189, to preach the gospel for several years in India, Clement took his master's place in that institution, and greatly increased its reputation by his philosophic knowledge, and the charm of his instructions. Many ancient authors assert that he was born at Athens, and in that city formed his eloquence and acquired his erudition. However that may be, it has from ancient times been the practice to surname him "*of Alexandria*," to distinguish him from the celebrated Clement of Rome, whom all the Church had honoured a century before him. In 202, the

[1] An allusion to Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

[2] Cap. xxii. and cap. viii., Para. iv., p. 19, ed. Leopold.

persecution of Septimius Severus having forced him to leave Egypt, he repaired to Jerusalem, and thence to Antioch; but some years after, towards the end of the reign of Caracalla, returned to Alexandria to resume his office of teacher, in which he continued to his death. He had an active mind, a prodigious memory, and great zeal for the advancement of the Christian faith. Unfortunately for the Church and himself, but to the great admiration of his age, he employed his genius in seeking to form an alliance between the religion of Jesus Christ and the philosophy he always professed. He aimed at making his Platonism serve as an introduction to Christianity; and thus this man, though of unquestionable piety, powerfully contributed to lower the faith and spiritual life in the Eastern Church. Such an undertaking can at no time and in no place be made without affecting the doctrine of original sin, which underlies all the teachings of Jesus Christ, but is a doctrine which has ever been rejected by human wisdom. We do not, therefore, quote Clement as an interpreter of sacred truth, but as a very faithful representative of the belief of his age on the canon of Scripture. In fact, he received the suffrages of all the ecclesiastical authors who came after him. "His writings," says Eusebius,[1] "are full of the most varied and useful erudition," (πλείστης χρηστομαθείας ἔμπλεοι.) "Full of erudition and eloquence," says Jerome,[2] "both as regards the Scriptures and all the documents of secular literature," (*tam de Scripturis quam de secularis literaturae instrumento.*) "What is there in these writings which is not learned? rather, which is not drawn from the depths of philosophy?" (*Quid in illis indoctum? Imo quid non e media philosophia est?*)

His principal writings which have come down to us are, his *Exhortation to the Gentiles,* (Λόγος προτρεπτικός;) his *Paedagogue,* in three books; his treatise *Quis Dives Salvetur,* addressed to rich Christians; above all, his *Stromata,* in eight books, a discursive collection of his thoughts, whether Christian or philosophic. He professes, in some measure, to introduce his readers to what he calls a more profound *Gnosis* or knowledge; and this

[1] He speaks in particular of the Stromata, H. E., vi. 18.
[2] Script. Eccl., cap. 48, and Ep. ad Magnum, cap. 2.

work, as he informs us himself,[1] must have appeared in 192, "222 years," he says, "after the battle of Actium." It is believed, also, that we have a work of his, (at least an abstract by Cassiodorus,) *Adumbrationes*,[2] or sketches on the catholic epistles. Lastly, we have lost his *Hypotyposes*, or, at least, only very short fragments have been recovered; it was a concise exposition of the contents of the Old and New Testaments.[3]

178. But the use of the Scriptures of the New Testament, quotations from their text, appeals to their infallibility as a sovereign judge of controversies, and the only source of all Divine truth, even of the mystic traditions which Clement admitted, and the frequent expression of his confidence in their universal inspiration,—all this is found in abundance in his writings. And not only is it his personal faith in the Scriptures collectively which he expresses in almost every page, not only his faith in each of the books, (for he continually quotes them,) it is the faith of the Church. In Kirchhofer's useful work[4] we may read a copious collection of these quotations. "Clement," this writer says in speaking of the Stromata—"Clement, almost in every page, cites passages taken from the New Testament, from all the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, each of Paul's Epistles, the First and Second Epistle of John, that of Jude, that to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. There is no part of the first canon of which some passage is not found quoted by him except the short Epistle to Philemon. But this is purely accidental, owing to the brevity of that epistle, which contains only twenty-five verses, and has nothing doctrinal. But it appears, according to Eusebius, that it was quoted in his book of the *Hypotyposes*, now lost; and, as we have seen, it was mentioned at the same period in Africa by Tertullian;[5] and at the same period, also, it was so fully recognised by the Christian world, that at Rome the audacious Marcion himself reckoned it as the ninth of Paul's epistles. "It is only the brevity of this epistle," wrote Tertullian, "which has allowed

[1] Stromata, i., pp. 339, 340. [2] For this reason the title is in Latin.

[3] The best edition of his works is by Potter, Oxford, 1715. 2 vols. folio. [A cheap and useful edition by Klotz, Lips., 1831. 4 vols. 8vo.—Tr.]

[4] Quellensammlung, &c., p. 22.

[5] Adv. Marc., v. 42. See also Epiph., Hæres., xlii. 9.

it to escape from the falsifying hands of Marcion." (*Sola huic epistolae brevitas sua profuit sit falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet.*) And Jerome,[1] in eulogising it, tells us, that if it had not been believed to be the apostle Paul's, "it would not have been received by all the churches throughout the world," (*in toto orbe a cunctis ecclesiis fuisse susceptam.*)

"In his book of *Hypotyposes*,"[2] says Eusebius, "Clement has given compendious accounts of all the canonical Scriptures, (*πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθέτου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις,*) without having even excepted the *Antilegomena*," (*μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών.*)

Instead of quoting here the principal passages in which each of our sacred books are mentioned by Clement, we think it will be more useful only to shew by some citations in what terms this father constantly spoke of the Scriptures of the New Testament.

179. In the third book of his *Stromata*,[3] Clement expressly distinguishes the four canonical Gospels from the apocryphal Gospel of the Egyptians. Speaking of a strange sentence, which the heretic Cassianus attributed to our Lord, he says,—"In the first place, we do not find this saying in the four Gospels that have been transmitted to us, (*ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους,*) but in that according *to the Egyptians.*"

He always places both Testaments in the same rank as the Word of God. Thus, in the second book of the *Stromata*,[4] he says,—"The just shall live by faith—by that faith which is according to the Testament and the commandments, (*τῆς κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς,*) since these two as to name and time being given economically, according to age and progress, are one as to their power, (*δυνάμει μία οὖσαι,*) the Old and the New are supplied by one God through the Son," (*ἡ μὲν παλαιὰ, ἡ δὲ καινὴ, διὰ υἱοῦ παρ' ἑνὸς θεοῦ χορηγοῦνται.*) He also calls the collective canon, *the Gospel of the Apostle, the Dominical Scriptures, the New Testament.*

[1] Comment. in Ep. ad Philem., procem, (Opp., tom. iv., p. 442.)

[2] Hist. Eccl., vi. 14.

[3] Strom., iii., cap. 13, § 93, p. 465, ed. Paris, 1629. Vol. ii., p. 266, ed. Klotz, Lips., 1831.

[4] II., cap. 6, § 29. Vol. ii., p. 141, ed. Klotz.

In the seventh book of the *Stromata*[1] he compares them to the Virgin Mary giving birth to the Lord, and yet remaining a virgin. "Such," he says, "are the Dominical Scriptures, (*αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαὶ*) giving birth to the Truth, and remaining virgins while concealing the mysteries of the Truth."

"We have for the beginning of the teaching,"[2] he says a little further, "the Lord, leading us from the beginning to the end of knowledge by means of the *prophets*, and by the *gospel*, and by the *blessed apostles*."

"Both the *gospel* and the *apostle*," he says again,[3] "command us to mortify the old man."

He always appeals to the Scriptures against his opponents as an inspired book, a universal rule, the sole rule of faith, the infallible judge of controversies.

In the seventh book of his *Stromata*,[4] he says, "Those who do not follow God when He leads, fall from their elevation; and He leads according to the divinely-inspired Scriptures," (*ἡγεῖται δὲ κατὰ τὰς θεοπνεύστους γραφάς.*)

And further on, "When we have refuted them by shewing that they are evidently in opposition to the Scriptures, (*σαφῶς ἐναντιουμένους ταις γραφαῖς,*) you always see their leaders do one or other of these two things, (*δυοῖν θάτερον,*) either despise the consequences of their own doctrines, or prophecy itself, or rather their own hope, (*ἢ γὰρ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τῶν σφετερων δογμάτων, ἢ τῆς ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΙΑΣ αὐτῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐλπίδος καταφρονοῦσιν.*)" To the Scriptures, also, Clement always appeals to explain the Scriptures. In the same paragraph he says, "When on the subject of the Scriptures, we give a perfect demonstration taken from the Scriptures themselves, (*οὕτως οὖν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν περι αὐτων γραφῶν τελείως ἀποδεικνύντες,*) we then from our faith persuade demonstratively, (*ἐκ πίστεως πειθόμεθα ἀποδεικτικῶς.*)"[5]

"For those who, with the design of doing good to others," he says again, "devote themselves to write or to preach the word, if

[1] Vol. vii., 16, § 94. Vol. iii., p. 280, ed. Klotz; p. 756, ed. Paris, 1629; p. 890, ed. Potter. [2] Vol. vii., 16, § 95. [3] P. 706, ed. Paris.
[4] Vol. vii., 16, § 101. Vol. iii., p. 286, ed. Klotz; p. 894, ed. Potter.
[5] Strom. vii., 16, § 96. Vol. iii., p. 282, ed. Klotz.

it is *useful* to acquire some other species of instruction, the reading of the Dominical Scriptures is *necessary* for the demonstration of the things said, (*ἤτε ἄλλη παιδεία χρήσιμος ἤτε τῶν γραφῶν τῶν κυριακῶν ἀνάγνωσις εἰς ἀποδείξιν τῶν λεγομένων ἀναγκαία.*)"[1]

"The truth," he says,[2] "is found by confirming each of the things that are demonstrated according to the Scriptures, by adducing other similar scriptures, (*ἐν τῷ βεβαιοῦν ἕκαστον τῶν ἀποδεικνυμένων κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ἐξ αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν ὁμοίων γραφῶν.*)"

Clement, in his philosophy, or Christian *Gnosis*, as he calls it, admitted the existence of a certain mystical tradition, which had been given by Christ to four of His apostles, solely on the concealed sense of Scripture, and which had since been transmitted only to certain rabbins of the Church, to be passed from them, from age to age, to a certain number of initiated persons, whom he calls *Gnostics*, or *Men of Gnosis*. And yet, in spite of this system of tradition, maintained by him alone, and combated at the same time by Irenæus, as well as Tertullian,[3] Clement did not cease to declare that the Scriptures are the universal rule of faith, for the gnostic initiated into their most profound sense, equally with the simple believer, (*Ὁ γνωστικὸς γαρ*, he says, *οἶδεν κατὰ τὴν γραφήν.*)[4]

"Those," he says again in the seventh book of the *Stromata*[5]— "those are *believers* who have only tasted the Scriptures, (*Οἱ μὲν ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν πιστοί,*) but those are the *Gnostics* who have advanced much further, and who become the exact *gnomons* of the truth. They discover the hidden senses, which are not perceived by the vulgar."

But we pass on to the pious Irenæus, who approaches much nearer even than Clement and Tertullian to the apostolic times.

[1] Strom., vi., 2, p. 786.

[2] Strom., vii., 16, § 96, p. 891. Vol. iii., p. 282, ed. Klotz.

[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres*, i., 242, p. 101; iii., 14 and 15, pp. 235, 237. Tertullian, De Præscript., cap. 8, 25. He calls it madness to suppose that the apostles had not revealed the same things to all, but taught certain things in secret to a few, (*quaedam secrete et paucis demandasse.*)

[4] Strom., vii., 11.

[5] Vol. vii., 16, § 95. Vol. iii., 281, ed. Klotz, Lips., 1832; p. 891, ed. Potter, Oxford, 1715; p. 757, ed. Heinsius, Paris, 1623.

Section Fifth.

IRENÆUS.

180. Irenæus, born among the Greeks of Asia about the year 120—that is to say, only seventeen years after the death of St John, and in the same parts where the apostle ended his days—had received in early life the culture of a Greek education, and at the same time the instructions of Christian discipline; for he had the happiness, he tells us, when he was yet a child, (*παῖς ὢν ἔτι,*) of being in frequent intercourse with the pious bishop of Smyrna, the martyr Polycarp. "This Polycarp," he says,[1] "instructed by the apostles, and familiar with many persons who had seen our Lord—this Polycarp who was placed by the apostles over the province of Asia as bishop of Smyrna—we have seen in our early years teaching all the things which he had learned from the apostles, (*ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ.*)" And again, in the interesting fragment preserved by Eusebius,[2] he thus writes at a later period:—

"O Florinus! these impious dogmas (of the Gnostics) are not what those taught you who were disciples of the apostles; for I have seen you, when I was yet a child, in Lower Asia, with Polycarp, when you shone at the imperial court, and sought to be distinguished there. I remember better what passed then than more recent events, for the things heard in childhood take root in the mind. I could tell the place where the blessed Polycarp sat; his appearance and his gait; his mode of life and his looks; and the discourses he made to the people; and his familiar intercourse with John, and with those who had seen the Lord; and how he repeated their discourses, and all which they had told him about the Lord, His miracles and His doctrine. But these things which Polycarp narrated were all in harmony with the Scriptures, (*πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαις.*) By the goodness of God, I heard them very attentively, committing them not to paper, but to my heart; and by the grace of God, I still recall them exactly to my mind."

We do not hesitate to give these minute details, because they shew

[1] Hæres, iii., 3. [2] Hist. Eccl., v., 19, 20.

at a glance how the abundant testimony to the Scriptures which comes before us reaches almost to the first origin of Christianity. Irenæus even tells us that he lived at a time when men might be met with who were enriched with *charisms*, (or miraculous powers received from the apostles by the laying on of hands.)[1] "We have ourselves," he says, "heard in the church many brethren who had prophetic charisms, (*προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἐχόντων,*) and who spoke divers languages by the Holy Spirit."[2]

We see in his works[3] that at the same time he had studied the literature and philosophy of his age. Tertullian also calls him "a zealous investigator of all kinds of knowledge."[4] He learned thoroughly the Celtic language, to render himself useful in preaching the gospel, and spoke it habitually. Thus, at the beginning of his book,[5] he apologises for not having the habit of writing, nor the elegances of language, (*λόγων τέχνην,*) "because," said he, "living among the Gauls, I am obliged to converse most frequently in a barbarous tongue," (*περὶ βάρβαρον διάλεκτον.*)

Irenæus was an eminent man, admired by all the Church for his missionary zeal, not less than for his wisdom and his charity. He preached, first of all, the gospel to pagans, and it is said that, by the advice of Polycarp, he set out from Smyrna with Pothinus to preach the word among the Gauls, and soon after took under his charge, at the peril of his life, the church recently formed at Lyons in the midst of idolaters. In 178, when Pothinus, who was his senior by several years, (having been born fifteen years before St John's death,) had suffered martyrdom with so many other believers at Lyons, Irenæus succeeded him in his episcopal office, and, at a later period, like him, was imprisoned; he was beheaded, it is said, under Septimius Severus, according to some, in 197, after the bloody victory which this emperor had gained at the gates of Lyons; according to others, in 202, when his general persecution raged against the Christians. Irenæus, in 177, during

[1] Acts viii. 17, iv. 19.

[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., v., 7. See also Irenæus, Hæres, v., 6.

[3] See his citations of poets and ancient philosophers, particularly in the nineteenth chapter of his second book.

[4] Or *all doctrines*. "Omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator."—*Contra Valentianos*, cap. v.

[5] Page 3. Grabe, Oxon, 1702.

the imprisonment of Pothinus, had been sent on a deputation by the Gallic churches to the bishops of Asia and the bishop of Rome, Eleutherus. He had afterwards to reprimand the successor of the latter for his intolerance. "When a man can do good to his neighbour, and refuses to do it," he wrote to him, "we must hold him to be a stranger to the love of the Lord." [1]

"His whole ministry," says Theodoret, "was a blessing to the churches of Gaul, as well as to the general cause of truth. He was the illuminator (φωστήρ) of the western Galatians, (the Gauls.) He composed commentaries, and many other works; but all, or nearly all, have perished excepting his great work *Against Heresies*, written specially on account of the Valentinian Gnostics, who, in his time, having found their way from Rome to Gaul, had perverted the faith of a great number of persons, particularly among females. Only short fragments of the original Greek have been recovered; but the entire work has been preserved to us in a Latin version, which is fourteen hundred years old.[2]

181. If we take up the folio of Irenæus, and open it at hazard, passing over the first pages, which are devoted to an exposition of Valentinian Gnosticism and its impious fancies, (its thirty Æons, the mother Achamoth, or the thirtieth Æon, and her progeny,)—passing these over, we may assert that it would be difficult to find a page in which one or other of our scriptures is not clearly quoted. We know not any modern author who has made more frequent use of them; and the reader, at the sight of such a book, will soon be constrained to acknowledge that the Christian people of the second century, as regards their knowledge and study of the Scriptures, were far superior to the Christian people of the nineteenth.

[1] Fragments of his epistle to Victor, in the works of Irenæus, p. 466 of Grabe's edition, 1702. Vol. ii., p. 457, Harvey's ed., Cambridge, 1857, (xxviii. of the Syriac Fragments.)

[2] We generally cite Grabe's edition, Oxford, 1702. Others prefer the Benedictine, which appeared ten years later. [The latest and best is that issued from the Cambridge University press, and edited by the Rev. W. Wigan Harvey, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo. It contains the fragments of the Syriac and Armenian versions, and additions to the Greek text from Hippolytus; with a preliminary dissertation on the Gnostic system, and an account of the life and writings of Irenæus, by the editor.—Tr.]

From the first page, we may learn what the whole book will be in this respect. The very first line of the preface has a quotation from the First Epistle of Paul to Timothy, (i. 4.) "Considering," he says, "that certain persons, sent out from among us to attack the truth, have introduced, as the apostle says, (*καθως ὁ ἀπόστολος φήσιν,*) lying words and *endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying, which is in faith*, leading astray the minds of the simple, falsifying the oracles of the Lord, (*ῥᾳδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια Κυρίου,*) and overthrowing many (*καὶ πολλοὺς ἀνατρέπουσιν,*) (2 Tim. ii. 18,) after having, under a vain pretext of science, (*gnosis,*) wandered far from Him who created and arranged the universe, as if they had to shew them anything better or greater than He. I have thought it necessary, dearly beloved, after having read the commentaries of Valentine's disciples, (as they call themselves,) to make thee acquainted with these monstrous mysteries, that thou mayest make them manifest to those who are around thee, and exhort them to keep themselves from this abyss of folly and blasphemy against Christ."

And if from these first lines you pass to the later ones, you will have some perception of the abundance, I may say profusion, with which this bishop of the second century cites our sacred books. Open, at the end of the volume, the beautiful thirty-sixth chapter, in which he explains the scenes of the last day. This chapter contains only fifty-four lines, and yet he has found room for quoting at length, besides two passages of the Old Testament, (Exod. xxxv. 40, and Isa. lxvi. 32,) twelve passages of the New Testament, in the following order:—Rev. xii. 5, 6; 1 Cor. vii. 31; Luke xx. 35; Matt. xxii. 2, and following; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26; and again, 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28; Matt. xxv. 29; Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. ii. 9; 1 Pet. i. 12. To give some idea, I shall quote the last thirty lines:[1]—

"Then, as the ministers of the Word teach us, *those who have been made worthy*[2] to dwell in heaven will be transported thither; some to taste the delights of paradise, others to share in the glory of the celestial city. In both abodes they will see God; but they

[1] We translate them from the obscure and ancient Latin version, for here the Greek original only offers a few disjointed fragments.

[2] Or *counted worthy*, (*κατὰξιωθέντες.*) The same expression is found in Luke xx. 35, xxi. 36.

will see Him in proportion to what they have been; for in that blessed dwelling-place, heaven, there will be that distance placed by God himself between those who have *borne fruit, some a hundred, some sixty, and others thirtyfold,* (Matt. xiii. 8, and Mark iv. 8;) and this is the reason why our Saviour said, that *in His Father's house there are many mansions,* (John xiv. 2.) All these joys will, in fact, come to them from God, who will assign to each his proper abode. For this reason, His Word[1] has said that the Father distributes to each one as He is *worthy, or will be worthy.* This is the *triclinium,* the table at which the guests will sit down who have a part in the marriage supper, (Matt. xxii. 2, and following verses;) for the ministers of the Word, the disciples of the apostles, tell us that this is the law of co-ordination, (*ad-ordinationem,*) according to which all who are saved will be arranged. Thus they advance by degrees, rising by the Spirit to the Son, and by the Son to the Father; the Son at last giving up His work to the Father, ACCORDING TO WHAT THE APOSTLE HAS SAID, (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26,) '*He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death;*' for in the time of this kingdom, the righteous man upon earth will know no more[2] what it is to die. '*But,*' ADDS THE APOSTLE, '*when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*' For this reason, John has carefully predicted *a first resurrection* of the just, (Rev. xx. 5,) and the inheritance of *a kingdom on earth,* (Rev. v. 10.) For this reason also, the apostles have prophesied it in the harmony of their revelations, (*concordantes;*) and this is what OUR LORD HIMSELF TEACHES when He promises to His disciples '*the new wine of the cup which he will drink with them in the kingdom of his Father,*' (Matt. xxv. 29.) Also, the APOSTLE declares that the time will come when the '*creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God,*' (Rom. viii. 21.) In and by all these revelations, one same God and Father is shewn to us who formed man, (*qui plasmavit homi-*

[1] "Verbum ejus." [2] "Obliviscetur."

nem,) who promised to the fathers the inheritance of the earth, who dispenses it to them in the resurrection of the just, and who thus, fulfilling the promises which He has made to them respecting the kingdom of His Son, accomplishes at last '*those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man*,' (1 Cor. ii. 9.) Thus, then, there is one only Son who has perfectly accomplished the will of the Father, and one human race in whom are consummated the mysteries of God, —mysteries which angels '*desired to look into*,' (1 Pet. i. 12,) although it is impossible for them to fathom the wisdom of God by which this creature is consummated, who is His workmanship, (*plasma ejus*,) to be rendered conformable to His Son, and of the same body with Him, (*concorporatum filio*;) so that His first-born, the Word, descends into the creature formed by His hands, that it may be received by Him; and, in its turn, the creature receives the Word, mounts up to Him, rises above angels, and is made in the image and resemblance of God." [1]

Such, then, was Irenæus, and such was the canon in the age of Irenæus. All our scriptures abound in his book—the four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, the Apocalypse.

182. And, first, as to the four Gospels. Irenæus quotes them continually; and this fact shews us how deeply, in days so near the apostles, their use, and the use of the four exclusively, had struck root in the mind of the Church. It is not only that Irenæus has written a long chapter, entitled,[2] "Proofs that there can be neither more nor fewer than Four Evangelists,"—it is not only that, looking at them always as a whole necessarily united, he has called them, on this account, "*The Gospel with Four Faces*;" he tries to find out mystic reasons for this quadruple form, which, though we may attach little value to them, attest only the more strongly the persuasion of Irenæus, and that of his age. As Olshausen [3] has remarked,—"If Irenæus thus spoke of the four Gospels to the men of his age, it must have been because the existing Church never knew a time in which it did not possess them." Irenæus compares the *quadriform Gospel* (τετράμορ-

[1] Lib. v., c. xxxvi. Tom. ii., pp. 428, 429, ed. Harvey, 1857.

[2] Lib. iii., c. xi., § 7. Tom. ii., p. 33. In the Benedictine edition this is the ninth chapter.

[3] Æchtheit, d. 4 Ev., § 272.

φον) to the four regions of the earth, to the four universal spirits, to the cherubim with four faces, &c. "The Church," he says, "is disseminated over the whole earth, but the column and support of the Church (*στύλος καὶ στήριγμα*) is *the gospel and the Spirit of life*. It was, then, befitting that it should have four columns spreading abroad incorruptibility, and vivifying humanity. And hence it is manifest that the Word, the Creator of all things, who is seated on the cherubim, and sustains all things, when He proposed to make Himself known to men, wished to give us the gospel under a quadruple form, which nevertheless is maintained in unity by one and the same Spirit, (*ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον.*)"[1] "But," he adds, "we have shewn, by very many and very powerful reasons, (*per tot et tanta ostendimus,*) on the one hand, why there are not a greater number than four; and, on the other, why there are not fewer, because these are the only true and firm ones, (*quoniàm sola illa vera et firma.*)"

"Things being so,"[2] he adds, "very vain and very ignorant, but much more audacious, (*μάταιοι πάντες καὶ ἀμαθεῖς, προσέτι δὲ καὶ τολμηροί,*) are all those who wish to alter this figure (*ἰδέαν*) of the gospel, and to give it more than four faces, or to give it fewer, And so great, in reference to the Gospels, is this firmness of which we speak, (*tanta est autem circa Evangelia hæc firmitas,*) that heretics themselves[3] bear testimony to it; and you see each one of them, when he comes forth, (*egrediens unus quisque eorum,*) endeavour to support himself by these same Gospels, to confirm his own doctrine, (*ex ipsis conetur confirmare doctrinam.*)"

183. And of what we have said of the belief of Irenæus and his age as to the four Gospels, is not less true as *to the book of Acts*. He quotes it also (we have reckoned by the index in Grabe, and we are certain that Grabe has often omitted passages) more than sixty-four times; and even sets himself to shew in his third book by a number of quotations, the harmony of this book of Luke with Paul's epistles.

[1] Chapter ix. of Book iii. in the Benedictine edition, but chap. xi. in Grabe's, pp. 214, 221. Tom. ii., p. 47, ed. Harvey.

[2] P. 223, ed. Grabe. Tom. ii., p. 50, ed. Harvey.

[3] The Ebionites, Marcion, Marcus, and Valentine.

His belief is not at all less firm as to the other books of the canon. He adduces them in equal abundance. We have counted, for example, in Grabe's index, that Irenæus has cited the First Epistle to the Corinthians one hundred and seven times, the Epistle to the Romans eighty-eight times, the Epistle to the Ephesians thirty-four times, the Epistle to the Galatians twenty-nine times, that to the Colossians twenty times, the Second to the Corinthians eighteen times, that to the Philippians eleven times, and the First of Peter the same number; the Second to the Thessalonians ten times, the First to Timothy five times, the Second four times, the short Epistle to Titus three times, the First Epistle of John three times, and the First to the Thessalonians twice. In a word, he cites ALL the books of the canon. There is only the Epistle to Philemon which he has not occasion to mention. And is this strange? This very short epistle, treating only of a point of domestic morals, having nothing doctrinal, had no chance of finding a place in a controversial work; and we have elsewhere said that, at the same time, Tertullian mentioned it in Africa, and that even the audacious Marcion acknowledged it as an epistle of Paul.[1]

184. The testimony borne by Irenæus to the canon of the second century is, then, irrefragable; but to render it complete, it is desirable to shew by some quotations selected from the abundance in his work, how firm was the faith of this same age in the Divine inspiration of all these books, in their sufficiency and their authority. The passages that prove it in the course of his book are so numerous that we are at a loss which to select. Everywhere in its pages the Scriptures are the foundation of his faith; by them it is to be re-established, and error is to be overturned; they are the only universal and Divine rule; and as Erasmus[2] has said, "Irenæus combats the squadrons of heretics by the weapons of the Scriptures alone."

"In employing," he says in his fifth book, "these proofs which are taken from the Scriptures, (*utens his ostensionibus quae ex Scripturis,*) you easily overturn, as we have shewn you, all those heretical sentiments which have been later imagined."[3]

The collection of our scriptures was already called by the name

[1] See above, Prop. 178.
[2] Præf. in Irenæum.
[3] Cap. xiv., p. 422, ed. Grabe, 1702. Tom. ii., p. 263, ed. Harvey.

of *the New Testament;* and throughout, Irenæus placed them in the same rank of authority as those of Moses and the prophets.

"The precepts of a perfect life," he says in his fourth book, "being the same in either Testament, (*in utroque Testamento cum sint eadem,*) reveal to us the same God."[1]

In his first book, Irenæus explains the doctrines of Valentine and his followers; in the second, he points out their evil; in the third, he confutes them by the Scriptures. Hear what he says at the beginning of the latter. "We had not known," he says, "the plan of our salvation excepting by those who brought us the Gospel. They from the first proclaimed it with the living voice; but then they have left us the tradition in the Scriptures by the will of God to be the foundation and pillar of faith after them."[2]

Elsewhere he says,[3] "In opposing the sound doctrine to the contradictions of heretics, following one teacher—the one and true God, and having His words for the rule of truth—we all say always the same things on the same points." And again—"If we cannot find solutions for everything that we read in the Scriptures, we must leave these questions with God, who also has created us; knowing on good grounds that the Scriptures are perfect, since they have been spoken by the Word of God and His Spirit, (*rectissime scientes quia Scripturae quidem perfectae sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictae.*)"[4]

In the whole course of his five books, you meet with such expressions as the following:[5]—"We prove it by the Scriptures"—"According to what we learn from the Scriptures, (*sicut ex Scripturis discimus*)"—"We have proved from the Scriptures, (*ex Scripturis demonstravimus*)"—"We have proved by the Dominical Scriptures"—"we must unfold (*ἀναπτύσσειν*) all that is contained in the Scriptures; if they had known the Scriptures, they would know"—"Let us return to the proof which is drawn from the Scriptures, (*quae est de Scripturis*)"—"Having for ourselves these proofs which are taken from the Scriptures, (*nobis conaboranti-*

[1] Chapter xii. in the Benedictine edition, and xxvi. in Grabe's, [chap. xxiii., ed. Harvey. Tom. ii., p. 178.]

[2] Tom. ii., p. 2, ed. Harvey.

[3] Lib. iv., c. 69; Grabe, p. 368. Tom. ii., p. 276, ed. Harvey.

[4] Lib. ii., cap. 47, p. 173; Grabe, c. 41; ed. Harvey, tom. i., p. 349.

[5] III., 5; ii., 28; iii., 11; iii., 21; ii., 30; iii. 19; i., 10; ii., 13; ii., 16; iii., 12. Paris, 1710.

his ostensionibus quæ ex Scripturis sunt)"—"The faith we maintain is firm, real, not imaginary, and alone true"—"This faith receiving from the Scriptures a manifest demonstration, (*manifestam habens ostensionem ex his Scripturis.*)"[1]

"John," he says elsewhere,[2] "wishing to establish a rule of truth in the Church, (*volens regulam veritatis constituere in Ecclesiâ*), has thus spoken :—

"'When we have refuted them by the Scriptures,'[3] he says of the heretics, (*cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur,*) 'they turn round, and *attack the Scriptures themselves*, as if *they erred*, or *expressed themselves improperly*, or *wanted authority*, (neque sint ex autoritate,) or *had different meanings*, or *were not sufficient to lead to the truth those who were not acquainted with tradition*, because the truth, they said, was not given in writing, but by the living voice.'"

185. Yet before we pass on, we must say a few words on the passages where this father appeals to *apostolic tradition*, and from which the Roman doctors believe that authority may be drawn for what is called among them in the present day, TRADITION. It is easy to see that in Irenæus it means quite a different thing. He never understands by the term, as is done at Rome, an oral transmission, apocryphal, and continued we know not by whom, of dogmas not contained in Scripture, or even of dogmas opposed to its teaching. On the contrary, this term is employed most frequently by him as by the other fathers, to designate the Scriptures. "The apostles, (he has just told us, Prop. 182,) after having preached the gospel with their living voice, have left us, by the will of God, the tradition of it in the Scriptures. (*Evangelium. . . . . postea per voluntatem Dei in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt.*)" The *Scriptures*, we see, are for Irenæus, tradition, the true tradition ; "*given by the will of God*," he adds, "*to be after them the foundation and pillar of Faith.*"

"This interpretation of which we speak,"[4] he says, "is in accordance with the *tradition of the apostles ;* for Peter, and John,

[1] III., 25, p. 256, Grabe. Tom. ii., p. 115, ed. Harvey.
[2] III., 11, p. 213. Tom. ii., p. 41, ed. Harvey.
[3] III., 2, pp. 199, 200. Tom. ii., p. 7, ed. Harvey.
[4] III., 25, p. 256, Grabe. Tom. ii., p. 115, ed. Harvey.

and Matthew, and Paul have thus spoken. In fact, the same Spirit of God who spoke in the prophets has also announced in the apostles the fulness of the time, and the approach of the kingdom of heaven."

"The fathers," the learned Mr Goode remarks, in his *Divine Rule*,[1] when speaking of Irenæus, and especially of those who followed him, "constantly employ the terms *Tradition* and *Apostolic Tradition*, (ἡ ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις,) to designate the Scriptures; and it is by a strange abuse that Messrs Newman and Keble cite them to support the totally different meaning given to this expression by the doctors of Rome." Mr Goode even shews that the passages from Athanasius, alleged by these authors in favour of tradition in the Roman sense, speak precisely the contrary, and recommend only the *Written Word*. We may see, by numerous quotations from Irenæus, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyrill of Alexandria, Socrates the historian, Cyprian, and even Jerome, that by *Evangelical Tradition* the fathers understood the Gospels as distinct from the Acts and the Epistles; and by *Apostolic Tradition*, the Acts and Epistles of the apostles.

It is very true that Irenæus, like the rest of the fathers, sometimes uses this expression to designate a still recent remembrance which was preserved of the apostles and their teaching, in the places where they had been heard; but even then, he employs it in a sense quite different from that of the Roman doctors. The heretics, when confounded by his quotations from the Scriptures, alleged the tradition of the apostles to justify their errors, and pretended to appeal to the wise teaching of these men of God. Irenæus, to refute them, was eager to request that they should really consult that tradition of the apostles which was still accessible, that is to say, the remembrance of them which remained during his times in the churches founded by them. Nothing could be more rational. If in our day, for example, any one maintained, in our presence, some historical falsehood relative to the passage of the Alps effected by Bonaparte fifty-eight years ago, before the battle of Marengo; and if the authors of the falsehood,

[1] Divine Rule of Faith and Practice. London, 1853. Vol. i., p. 68; also, vol. iii., pp. 23, 26.

refusing the testimony of books, appealed to the oral traditions collected on the spot, we should be able, like Irenæus, to accept the challenge, to turn with confidence this source of information against them, and to challenge them to find in their favour any trustworthy testimony. But if, instead of Napoleon, the points in question regarded Hannibal, and, instead of the passage of the Alps by the French, that of the Carthaginians, two thousand and seventy-five years ago, we should look back upon it as an absurdity to appeal to local tradition, and should be perfectly sure that, at this distance of time, nothing could be expected from it. So it was with Irenæus.

He never thought of a tradition infallible for ages, or transmitted from generation to generation without its being known how. But when the Valentinians, unable to impugn his arguments from Scripture, presumed to oppose to them the oral teaching of the apostles, his reply was, "We know it better than you, and we can easily recover it in the churches they founded." It was then only the second age of Christianity; the living remembrance was preserved of the succession of bishops who had followed them; in many places were still to be found (as Irenæus has told us) "men invested with charisms which they had received from an apostle,[1] or even some ancient believers who had conversed with the immediate disciples of Jesus Christ." It was, then, perfectly legitimate for the father to appeal to such reminiscences. "Dearly beloved," he exclaims at the beginning of his third book,[2] complaining of the Gnostics and their bad faith, "see the men with whom we have to combat. They glide under all our proofs like serpents, and so it comes to pass that they will not submit to the Scriptures at first, nor even to tradition afterwards, (*evenit itaque neque Scripturis jam, neque traditioni consentire eos.*) Thus, in all the Church, the men who wish to see the truth can recognise the tradition of the apostles rendered manifest to the whole world. We have only to enumerate the bishops instituted by them in the different churches and their successors down to ourselves: they have never taught anything nor known anything similar to the absurdities in which these teachers indulge, (*qui nihil tale docue-*

[1] See above, Prop. 180.

[2] III., ii., p. 200, Grabe. Tom. ii., p. 8, ed. Harvey.

runt neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur.)" And in the two chapters that follow,[1] Irenæus aims again to confound his Marcionite and Valentinian opponents by the very kind of testimony they dared to call in, in the first, which he entitles, "Of the Succession of Bishops since the Apostles," and in the second, entitled, "The Testimony of Those who saw the Apostles, concerning the Preaching of the Truth."

We see, then, what Irenæus meant by the term *Tradition* was a recent and tangible tradition, (*veterem traditionem apostolorum;*) not a late, apocryphal, untraceable tradition, such as the bishops of Rome appeal to after 1700 years. Irenæus meant a human and fallible, though well-informed, tradition; not that so-called Divine and infallible, though very misinformed, tradition which the Council of Trent has presumed to put on a level[2] with the Scriptures, and even above them.[3]

Further; These reminiscences of the apostles, which might still be recovered in the local traditions, Irenæus, whatever respect he had for them, never failed to subject to the control of the Sacred Scriptures. He never admitted any tradition, however near it might be, if it taught what was not taught by the written Word. And in that famous epistle to Florinus[4] which we have quoted, you see, after calling to mind the recitals of Polycarp respecting John, and those of John respecting Jesus Christ, he takes care to add that these traditions reported by that holy bishop respecting John and Jesus Christ were *all conformable to the Scriptures,* (*ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς.*) So sensitive on this point was his holy jealousy for the supremacy of the written Word.

"Having for our rule," he says in his second book,[5] "the very truth and the testimony concerning God *fully revealed,* (*et in aperto positum de Deo testimonium,*) we ought not, by allowing ourselves to go hither and thither in search of other solutions of the questions, to reject the firm and true knowledge of God. What if we cannot find an answer to all the difficulties presented

[1] III. and iv., pp. 200, 205, ed. Oxon., 1706. Tom. ii., pp. 8, 15, ed. Harvey.
[2] "Pari pietatis et reverentiæ affectu."—Session 4, first decree.
[3] Ibid., second decree, 28th April 1546. [4] See Prop. 180.
[5] Cap. xlvii., p. 173, ed. Oxon., 1702. Tom. i., p. 349, ed. Harvey.

in the Scriptures? . . . . We ought to leave them to God, who also created us, (Prop. 184,) knowing assuredly that the Scriptures are perfect, because they have been uttered by the Word of God and His Spirit."

"It is thus by making use of those proofs which are taken from the Scriptures, (*his ostensionibus quae sunt ex Scripturis,*) you will easily overturn all those false notions which have been since devised, (*facile evertis . . . . omnes eas, quae postea affictae sunt, haereticorum sententias.*)"[1]

"And if any one should ask[2] us what did God do before He created the world? we say that the answer is God's concern. For the Scriptures teach us that this world, created perfect, had its beginning in time; but what God did before this, no Scripture informs us, (*nulla Scriptura manifestat.*) It is, then, a question which concerns God alone, and must be left to His sovereignty (*subjacet ergo haec responsio Deo.*)"

To sum up all in one word, Irenæus declares of the Valentinians, "that in relying on traditions not contained in the Scriptures, they are making a rope of sand." "When they go on in this manner,"[3] he says, "and advance what neither the prophets proclaimed, nor the Lord taught, nor the apostles delivered, (*παρέδοκαν,*) pretending to know more than others, by making allegations that are not taken from what is written, (*ἐξ ἀγράφων ἀναγινώσκοντες,*) they only busy themselves with twisting ropes of sand, (*ἐξ ἄμμου σχοινία πλέκειν ἐπιτηδεύοντες.*)"

Section Sixth.

OTHER CONTEMPORARY FATHERS.

186. Such was Irenæus; such were Clement and Tertullian; such was the second half of the second century in the East and West, and such was its canon. But if we have thought it proper to cite so copiously these three illustrious fathers, on account of the immense weight of their testimony, it is not because we cannot adduce others of the same period, and of whom some short writings

[1] V., 14, p. 422. Tom. ii., p. 363, ed. Harvey.
[2] II., 47. Tom. i., p. 352, ed. Harvey.
[3] I., 1, § 15, p. 35. Tom. i., p. 66, ed. Harvey.

remain to us, or fragments preserved by Eusebius. We wish to speak of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, converted in 150, and author of an Apology, which is still extant;—of Athenagoras, a philosopher of Athens, converted to Christianity, and flourishing in 177;—of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth about 170, and martyr in 178;—and, lastly, of Asterius Urbanus, bishop or teacher of the churches of Galatia, to whom he preached with power in the city of Ancyra about the year 188.

187. DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH, Eusebius tells us, (Hist. Eccl., iv., 23,) complains that, having written some letters, "there had been forgers, ministers of the devil, who had falsified them; but can I be surprised," he adds, "since even some persons have attempted to tamper with *the Dominical Scriptures*, (*ἐι καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν βαδιουργῆσαί τινες ἐπιβέβληνται γραφῶν.*)" It is thus he names the New Testament.

ASTERIUS URBANUS wrote, Eusebius tells us,[1] three books against the Montanists. "I hesitated for some time to publish them," said Urbanus; "not that I had any doubts on the duty of bearing witness to the truth, but for fear of appearing to go in any degree beyond what is written, and to determine anything beyond the word of the New Testament of the gospel, from which nothing can be taken away, and to which nothing can be added, whoever is resolved to regulate his life according to that same gospel, (*ᾧ μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτ' ἀφελεῖν δυνατόν, τῳ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτὸ πολιτεύεσθαι προῃρημένῳ.*)" Thus this doctor in Galatia spoke nearly a hundred years after St Paul. Not only he wished that the life should be governed according to the word of the New Testament, but he would admit no other tradition of Jesus Christ and the apostles.

ATHENAGORAS, though the nature of his writings calls less for citations from the Scriptures, presents us with many passages borrowed either from the Gospels or the Epistles. For example: "It is evident," he says, in a treatise on the *Resurrection of the Dead*,[2] "according to the apostle, that *this corruptible must put on incorruption*, (*ὅτι δεῖ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον,*) in order that, the dead being restored to life by the resurrection, *each one may*

[1] Hist. Eccl., v., 16, p. 228. Ed. Reading, vol. i. [2] Pp. 61, 62.

receive justly according to what he has done in his body, whether good or evil."[1]

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH is still more precise. Converted, it is said, in mature life, by the power of the gospel in the year 150, he composed, Jerome tells us,[2] *Commentaries on the Four Gospels*, books against *Marcion* and *Hermogenes*, and *catechetical* works, entirely lost. But we can here adduce numerous passages from his *Apologetic Treatise*, in three books, to his ancient friend Autolycus, still a pagan and a violent opponent of Christianity. He often cites the Gospels and Epistles, but indicates them in general terms, as he needs must in addressing pagans. Let us give a few examples.

Observe how, among other things, he enforces on Autolycus[3] the inspiration of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament:—"But as to the righteousness of which the law has spoken, we find analogous things both in the prophets and the evangelists, (*ἀκολουθα εὑρίσκεται καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν ἔχειν,*) because all inspired men (*pneumatophori*) have spoken by one and the same Spirit of God, (*διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἑνὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαληκέναι*).

Notice, again, how he cites the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew:—"But the EVANGELIC VOICE recommends chastity with still greater force, when it says, *Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her*, &c., and whoever *shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery*, &c.; and so again for charity, the EVANGELIC HISTORY says, *Love your enemies, pray for them that persecute you*, &c.; and again, for humility, the Gospel says, *Let not thy left hand know*, &c.

Observe, again, how he cites the Epistle to the Romans (xiii. 7, 8):—"THE DIVINE WISDOM[4] commands us *to render to every one their due, honour to whom honour, fear to whom fear, tribute to whom tribute, and to owe nothing to others unless to love all.*" And the first Epistle to Timothy (ii. 2):—"Besides this, our DIVINE

[1] These are the words of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 54, and 2 Cor. v. 10.

[2] In a letter to Algasius, (tom. iv., p. 197; Bâle, 1537.) See his Prooemium in Matthaeum.

[3] Lib. iii., p. 126.

[4] Ad Autolycum, lib. iii., p. 126. "Divina Sapientia," (at least in the Latin version.)

WORD, (ἡμῶν θεῖος λόγος,) as to the duty of subjection to magistrates, commands even to pray for them *that all may lead a peaceable and tranquil life.*" And in his second book, speaking of the inspired Scriptures collectively, and of the Gospel of John, "Mark," said he, "what the Holy Scriptures and all the pneumatophori (καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι) teach us, of whose number John has said, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God,*" &c.[1]

Such, then, was the second century in its latter half, and such the firmness of its faith in the first canon.

What, then, do we infer from all these testimonies, so unanimous and so powerful, which come at once from Antioch, from Galatia, from Macedonia, from Carthage, and from Gaul?

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE RESULT OF ALL THESE TESTIMONIES.

188. We must first of all clearly understand that these quotations do not only express to us the unanimous personal persuasion of all these great teachers, so different in position, character, and nationality; not only the faith of the contemporary Church, not only the very great firmness, as Irenæus said, of this faith as to the four evangelists, (*tanta circa evangelia haec firmitas,*) its very great firmness respecting the book of Acts and the thirteen Epistles of Paul, as well as the two Epistles of Peter and John; but above all, that which these testimonies confirm to us with irresistible power is, the historic legitimacy of this faith,—the necessarily apostolic origin of all these twenty books,—their perfect and indisputable authenticity. And this proof itself is so powerful, that it may, we think, suffice alone, though we had not all the others, neither those that precede, nor those that follow.

Let us carry ourselves back in thought to the age so near the apostles in which these teachers lived, and ask how it could have been possible, if the unanimity of all the churches on the subject of the twenty books had not commenced during the lifetime of the apostles, that, in only fifty years from the death of John, a conviction so perfectly unanimous, so calm, and so self-assured,

[1] Lib. ii., p. 100.

could, in so short a time, pervade the whole Christian world. How otherwise can this vast phenomenon be explained? Who can tell by what other process this persuasion could be formed from one end of the empire to the other,—formed among the Latins as well as the Greeks, among the Celts as well as the Syrians,—formed in such a manner that not only these books were everywhere received as divinely inspired, but everywhere without the least shadow of debate; everywhere attributing them to the same authors, although their names were not inscribed; everywhere classing them in the canon in the same order; everywhere four Gospels, neither more nor fewer, says Irenæus, (*per tot et tanta demonstravimus sola illa vera et firma;*) everywhere first Matthew, then Mark, then Luke, then John, and everywhere attributing the first and fourth to apostles, the second and third to inspired men (*pneumatophori*) who were not apostles, while no sign seemed to point out the authors in any of the three synoptic evangelists; everywhere, lastly, the book of Acts attributed to Luke; then, again, everywhere the thirteen epistles of Paul always placed in the same order, which was by no means the order of time; everywhere at their head the epistle to the Romans; then those to the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians; then to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon; then the two epistles of Peter and John; for, as we have said, these twenty books have never changed their respective places;[1] that one of these two epistles which was written from Babylon having made its way among the churches of Africa or Gaul, to take its place there, as the letters written from the prisons of Rome made theirs among the Greek churches of Egypt, or the Syrian churches of Adiabene?

189. How, then, can we account for this unanimity, at once so peaceable and so firm, on the subject of the twenty books, unless by admitting the only reasonable explanation that can be given; I mean, unless by recognising in this universal agreement a consent begun during the life of the apostles, and under their influence, and borne peaceably over the whole habitable globe in proportion

[1] Some have placed the Acts at the end of the epistles, and some others have placed the catholic epistles before St Paul's thirteen; but the latter have always in other respects, like the four evangelists, preserved their respective order.

as the Church was extended? Moreover, this fact results very naturally, as we have already said, from that other, that almost all the apostles governed, during more than thirty years, the innumerable churches founded by them; some for a much longer time, and John himself for seventy years. Setting aside this explanation, which gives a reason for everything, how can it be explained that, in the short space of half a century, any one of the twenty books of the canon came to be received without any opposition throughout the world by all the teachers, all the bishops, and all the churches; everywhere taking its fixed place in their canon; everywhere in silence; everywhere, at least, without leaving in any part of the Church the slightest trace of any challenge? And this among such believers as were the Christians of the second century, among influential, learned teachers, connected with both the East and West, vigilant, zealous, and ready to suffer martyrdom, among men so jealously careful of the slightest apostolic reminiscences that you see them at the very time holding councils, and on the very point of excommunicating one another[1] in the East and West. And for what?—for an unimportant difference as to the time of keeping Easter, some having learned from their predecessors in the East to celebrate it, like the ancient Jews, on the fourteenth day of the month of March; others having been taught in the West to defer it to the following Sunday. To check Victor's fiery temper, was not the pious wisdom of Irenæus required, and the severe letters of many other bishops, who, even in the West, enjoined upon him (*ἀντιπαρακελεύονται*) to alter his language?[2]

Have we ever seen anywhere in so short a time an agreement suddenly formed, so perfect as that in the Church, from one end of the earth to the other, on a subject of such great importance as the apostolic authenticity of twenty sacred books? Would it be an easy matter, in our day, to deceive all Europe on the subject of works which it has agreed to attribute to men deceased only in the year 1800—Lavater, Saussure, Mallet-Dupan, Kant, Necker,

[1] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., v., 23. See what he says of Irenæus, of Polycrates, of Palmas, of Victor, of Bachyllus.

[2] See Socrates, Hist. Eccl., v., 22. This controversy did not terminate till thirty-five years later, at the Council of Nice.

Blair, or Klopstock? Could we receive without protest these new works, unknown to their contemporaries, unknown to every one, to this day? Would it even be possible to receive easily and without discussion, in literature, apocryphal works of Voltaire or of Rousseau, who died eighty years ago? And yet the world is very slightly interested in settling about such men the legitimacy of any works that may be attributed to them, while in the time of Irenæus and Tertullian, for the sacred books, the issue involved all the churches, all the Christians on the face of the globe. The question for all regarded the Word of Life, and in its profession or defence they were ready to lay down their lives.

190. And let no one think of adducing as a parallel to this incomparable unanimity of the second century on the canon, that presented by Roman Catholicism in the present day on all the dogmas which separate it from evangelical Christianity.

Do we not know the commotion each of these heresies made in all quarters before it could be imposed on the world? Do we not know that councils and popes shook empires by long wars before reception was given first to the worship of images, and invocation of the dead, and then to the celibacy of the clergy, the depression of the bishops, the withholding the cup, and transubstantiation? And even in our day do we not know that only after ages of violent controversy Rome has been able to promulgate her new doctrine about Mary?[1] It was totally different with the unanimity of the churches on the first canon in the second century. You could not then see throughout the Christian world, on this subject, the slightest trace of a difference of opinion either in the East or West; and you know that 150 years later, when Eusebius called the twenty-two books of the first canon and the second-first *homologoumena*, or *uncontroverted*, he meant to say, that these scriptures had never been disputed anywhere; while in speaking of the five short late epistles he calls them *antilegomena*, or *controverted*, to intimate that though acknowledged by the majority they yet had been with others the subject of discussion. But as to the twenty-two *homologoumena*, looking at the past in history

[1] See the learned work recently published on this subject by M. L. Durand at Brussels, 1859.

to the farthest limits of the horizon, it was impossible for him to discover a vestige of the least opposition.

We have here a right to ask how this universal agreement can be accounted for, if it is not acknowledged that these books had been received by all the churches before the apostles had ended their career. We ask what an immensity of influence in some, and of imbecility in others, must have been required for any one of the four Gospels, or the book of Acts, or any one of the fifteen apostolic epistles, to have taken its place, after the death of the apostles, without discussion, in the canon of all the churches. In truth, this twofold miracle of cleverness on the one side, and ignorance on the other, surpasses very far in improbability all the legends of the Middle Ages, and would demand in our opponents a larger amount of faith than the gospel requires of believers, to make them admit that our holy books have been given by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven.

191. To assert that since John's death, Christians all over the world have received as apostolic, books which the apostles never put forth,—that they received them, without demur or examination, from one end of the empire to the other, and admitted them everywhere to be publicly read,—that even the apostolic churches of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Galatia, received them as if these books had been addressed to them eighty years before, while, in fact, nothing was known of them till the middle of the second century; to assert that all these churches agreed entirely to give these new books in the collected form of a canon, a rank everywhere the same and invariable; to assert that they were all deceived at the same time, all in the same manner, in Egypt, in Gaul, in Greece, in Africa; that all practised the most silent submission about the same books, and the same names of authors—verily, this surpasses all the limits of possibility.

Certainly, we grant, it is not thus that deception is practised, nor is it thus that persons err when they are deceived. So many people seduced from the path of truth do not advance with this perfect unanimity towards the same mass of errors, especially when they have to do with numerous and definite facts—such, for example, as the reception of twenty-two writings attributed to five

different authors. The chances of error are diverse in a multitude who have lost their way; and we may well say of this unanimity what the great Tertullian [1] said in the same age, when, speaking on another subject, he exclaimed, "Is it probable that so great a number of churches, and such large ones, should meet in one and the same faith, while all were walking in error, (*ecquid versimile est ut tot et tanta in unam fidem erraverint?*) Among so many persons, and so many different chances, the issue could not be the same; and when you find in this great number one single identical thought, this must proceed, not from error, but from tradition, (*Nullus inter multos eventus unus est. Quod apud multos unum invenitur, non est erratum, sed traditum.*)"

192. We conclude, then, after hearing all these voices of the second century in its second half, that, not to fall into absurdity, we must recognise, with all simplicity, the fact, (otherwise manifest on so many other grounds,) the only fact which furnishes a satisfactory reason—namely, that all the *homologoumena* were already collected before St John's death, and that the Christians of the second century only held them so firmly because their predecessors had received them from the apostles.

And thus we conclude that the testimony of the latter half of the second century is sufficient of itself to establish the historic certainty of the first canon; that is to say, the incontestable apostolic authenticity of all the sacred books of which it is composed.

These books are, as we have said,[2] eight-ninths of the New Testament; but since almost the whole body of these historic proofs apply (as we shall immediately see) to two other books, which, Eusebius says, were always uncontroverted for the two first centuries of the Church, it results that our proofs attest, by the voice of history alone, the authenticity of thirty-five thirty-sixths of the New Testament.

Yet we shall furnish fresh proofs; for our records mount higher, and give us witnesses of the first half of the second century, or even of the last years of the first. These latter join hands with the apostolic fathers, who saw with their own eyes the messengers

[1] De Praescript. Haereticor., cap. xxviii.
[2] Prop. 26.

of the Lord; and these fathers, in their turn, join hands with the apostles, who speak to us sometimes themselves of some of the writings of the New Testament.

However, before hearing the writers of the first half of the second century, it will be desirable to examine more closely that very remarkable record which we owe to the researches of Muratori, for it seems to take its proper place between the first and second half of the second century.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FRAGMENT CALLED MURATORI'S.

193. More than a century ago, this document was only known to the learned world by the publication[1] of the celebrated antiquary who discovered it in 1738 in a very ancient Latin manuscript of the Ambrosian Library of Milan. But more recently, we have seen three independent editions, made from the original by Nott,[2] Wieseler,[3] and Hertz.[4]

The manuscript itself, in uncial characters, and without any interval between the words, presents a strange state of disorder—whether owing to the translator, whose Latin is full of gross mistakes, or to the editor and copyist, whose sentences appear very often transposed and suddenly interrupted.[5] This state of the manuscript, as well as our ignorance of its precise date, of its author, and even of the character of the whole composition, (for it appears to have made part of an apologetic dialogue against some contemporary heretic,)—all these circumstances united (we have already said[6]) have prevented our drawing precise conclusions from it in our history of the Canon; but the incontestable antiquity of the manuscript makes it, notwithstanding, a document most worthy of attention.

[1] Antiq. Ital. Medii Aevi. Milan, 1740.

[2] See Dr Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae, (2d ed., 1846,) i., 394, 403.

[3] See Studien u. Krit., 1847, p. 815, and 1856, part i.

[4] See Bunsen's Analecta Ante-Nicaena, i., p. 137, &c.

[5] Any one may judge of this for himself, by looking at the exact copy given by Credner in his Geschichte der Canons, p. 71, &c., 1847. It may be also found in Mr Westcott's work on the Canon, at the end of the volume, p. 557. Cambridge, 1855.

[6] Prop. 31.

Muratori assigns the authorship to Caius; Bunsen to Hippolytus; others, with equal right, suppose it to be of a more recent date. These are mere conjectures: it is enough for us to know that the author says he was a contemporary of Pius I, (the ninth bishop of Rome, from 145 to 157,) and that he must be necessarily younger than the heretics of the second century, whose striking testimony we are soon about to examine; for he speaks of Marcion, Valentine, Basilides, and even the Cataphrygians; and this is why, in our going back from a later to an earlier period, we give him a place here.

It is generally admitted that it was originally written in Greek; for this language was then the most used in the Church of Rome; —the language of Paul, Peter, Timothy, and Luke; the language of Clement and of Pius I, as well as of Justin Martyr, Hermas, Tatian, Caius, and Hippolytus. It was the language of Irenæus when he wrote from Lyons, though at Lyons itself he conversed habitually in Celtic.[1] It was also the language of the first liturgies of the Roman Church, and of its first sermons.[2]

194. But this ancient fragment, in its obscure language, gives a very clear testimony to our first canon, and we find in it, as we are about to state, a remarkable catalogue of our sacred books. Although the first words are wanting, and the manuscript begins in the middle of a phrase, you see at once that the writer is explaining how the four Evangelists were given.

"THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE," he says, "IS THE THIRD," (these words are written in red capitals;) and, forthwith, the author enters into details on the person of Luke.

"THE FOURTH GOSPEL," he adds, "IS THAT OF JOHN, ONE OF THE DISCIPLES." Then follow, on the person of John, fresh particulars, in which these two important statements occur.

The first statement is, that in the very variety of the teachings of each of the Gospels, there is no difference as to the faith of believers, (*nihil tamen differt credentium fidei,*) since in all, by one and the same sovereign Spirit, (*cum uno et principali Spiritu,*) all things are declared (*declarata sint in omnibus omnia*) touching the Saviour's nativity, His passion, His resurrection, His conversations with His disciples, and His double advent—the first, already

[1] Irenæus, Hæres., i., προοίμιον, p. 3. [2] Bunsen's Hippolytus, ii., 123.

passed, in humiliation; the second, yet to come, in the glory of His kingly power.

The second statement is, that John calls himself not only the *spectator* and *hearer*, but also the *narrator* of all the miracles of the Lord; since he declares the same things in HIS EPISTLES, (*singula etiam in* EPISTOLIS SUIS *proferat*,[1]) and since he says, speaking of himself,—"The things we have seen with our eyes, which we have heard with our ears, and which our hands have touched, (*palpaverunt*,) this is what we have written."

195. We see, then, on the one hand, the four Gospels announced in the fragment as forming a distinct unity, and universally recognised as to their design, their contents, and their inspiration. No difference is made between the two apostles (Matthew or John) and those of the two evangelists (Mark or Luke;) they have all four the same authority in the Church; they are the work of one and the same Spirit; not a doubt is admitted or mentioned. And then, on the other hand, we see the Epistles of John recognised equally as written by the same apostle, in order to give us the same teachings as his Gospel. The fragment even cites the first verse of his first Epistle (1 John i. 1.)

196. After this Gospel comes the Acts.

"But the Acts of all the Apostles," the fragment says, "have been written in a single book by Luke, who addressed it to the excellent Theophilus, telling him things of which he was an eye-witness, and for this reason not reporting either the martyrdom of Peter, or Paul's journey to Spain."

Then come the thirteen Epistles of Paul.

"Now the Epistles of Paul," continues the fragment, "declare to those who wish to understand it from what place, and for what reasons, they were written."

The author here enumerates them all, but in an order different from that we have been accustomed to follow, and evidently determined by the particular object which he is pleased to attribute to the apostles for each of them. "Paul," he says, "addresses his letters to *seven churches*, having doubled those which he wrote to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians. Nevertheless," he adds, "it

[1] The text has *profaram*, but in these quotations we have corrected (as Bunsen, Hartz, and Wieseler have done) the manifest errors and barbarisms of the text.

must be acknowledged that there is but one Church alone spread over all the globe, (*una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse dignoscitur*,) and for this reason, John, in the APOCALYPSE, even when he writes to *seven churches*, addresses himself to all. But, besides these letters to seven churches, Paul wrote one to Philemon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy."

197. Let it be carefully noticed that the whole of our first canon is repeated in this fragment, with the single exception of the *First Epistle of Peter*, which certainly has its place elsewhere in the same document, as we shall proceed to shew; and there are equally recognised (we may observe in passing) the Apocalypse and the two short Epistles of John, and also the general Epistle of Jude.[1]

But at this point the fragment, in its disorder, proceeds to name some other books which, according to it, were *illegitimate*. "There are reported, also, (*fertur etiam,*)" it says, "an epistle to the Laodiceans, and another to the Alexandrians, invented under the name of Paul to aid the heresy of Marcion, and many others which cannot be received into the Catholic Church; for it is not fit to mingle gall with honey."

The Epistle of Jude, *indeed*, (sane,) he adds, and[2] two epistles of John, of which we have spoken above, (*et superscripti Johannis duae,*) are reckoned among the catholic epistles, (*in catholica habentur.*)

198. It must be carefully noted here that the fragment which, in reference to Jude and John, has just named them *catholic epistles*, does not enumerate the group in its usual place. This group should be found, as in general, either following the Acts or following Paul's epistles. Every one in fact admits that, in its actual disorder, the document evidently betrays transpositions and lacunae. This explains why the first catholic Epistle of Peter, which has never been doubted anywhere, and which, with the first of John, forms the kernel of the catholic Epistles, which had just been spoken of, is not here mentioned, any more than that of

[1] Wieseler (Stud. u. Krit., 1856, p. 98) thinks that the Epistle to the Hebrews is also designated by the words, *Alia ad Alexandrinos*, (to the Egyptian Diaspora.) It would have for its readers, he says, the Jewish Christians of Alexandria.

[2] *Two*, or *the two*; Bunsen alone has written *in Catholicis*.

James; while the first of John has been mentioned, as if by chance and out of its place. This defect is easily explained by the fragmentary state of the document, by which the connexion of the parts is so frequently interrupted.

In fact, having arrived so far, the manuscript goes on with this strange sentence on the book of Proverbs: "And the wisdom written," he says, "by the friends of Solomon in his honour." This expression, which occurs so strangely in a place where no one would expect it, would be absolutely unintelligible, if we did not see in it (as Bunsen thinks) a fragmentary allusion to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, like the Book of Solomon, had been written by some friend of Paul, and not by himself.

Lastly, the document adds, "We receive only the (*Apocalypses*) Revelations of John and of Peter. And some of our people are not willing that the latter should be read in the church."

It is immediately in connexion with these words that he mentions, on the one hand, *Hermas*, and, on the other, the principal heretics of the age. "Hermas," he says, "has written in our day in Rome, *The Shepherd*, during the time that Pius, his brother, filled the see of the church of Rome. It should be read; but cannot be published to the people in church, neither among the prophets, of which the number is complete, nor among the apostles, to the end of time. As to Arsinoüs, or Valentine, or Miltiades, we absolutely receive nothing of theirs. Some psalms, also have been attributed to Marcion and to Basilides; and as to the chief of the Cataphrygians of Asia" . . . . .

Here the fragment ends abruptly. Whatever may be thought of these latter details, on which we do not wish to dwell, we see sufficiently the remarkable testimony which this ancient document, with all its want of arrangement, bears to our first canon.

We pass now to the first half of the second century.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

199. We have some important witnesses to produce during this epoch; but we must observe that the chronological divisions of these ancient times are necessarily deficient in exactness. For as Irenæus might be classed in this period by the date of his birth, and the acts of his youth, so there are many of the apostolic fathers, of whom we cannot speak but under the head of the first century, although they made themselves heard also in the second. After all, it has appeared most convenient to classify both the one and the others by the most active years of their ministry.

Section First.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

200. At the middle of the second century, if we go back till towards the end of Trajan's reign, (who died in 117,) in traversing the long reigns of Antoninus Pius and Hadrian, we arrive at a more extensive diffusion of the gospel,—at the first general persecutions, and the first Apologies published in order to arrest their course,—and likewise at the first great Gnostic sects, and the writings, already numerous, which combated them. This period, so important from its proximity to the origin of Christianity, and yet so troubled by imperial violence without, and by heresies within, gave birth to numerous publications which are now lost, letters, chronicles, controversies, treatises, dogmatic essays, and especially apologies, all written in Greek. It might be styled "the age of Greek Apologists." Almost all these books have perished, and

we have scarcely any knowledge of the writers and their writings excepting by the accounts of Eusebius. If we cast our eyes over the list of the fathers, (Prop. 168,) we shall see that, confining ourselves to those who were born in the second century, and reserving the apostolic fathers for the following section, there remains scarcely any one to be noticed here but Justin Martyr. In fact, though Theophilus of Antioch was born about the year 110, we have been obliged to place him in the latter half of the second century, because he was not converted from paganism till about the year 150. And, on the other hand, we cannot adduce as testimonies with Justin any of the contemporary authors enumerated by Eusebius, because there are none of their works extant. Neither that Hegesippus, who, after Luke, is the most ancient ecclesiastical historian; nor that Dionysius of Corinth, of whom there were eight letters,[1] and of which we regret, above all, that which he wrote to the church of Nicomedia against the errors of Marcion, because it would, no doubt, have furnished us with abundant quotations from the New Testament; nor that Quadratus, bishop of Athens, who by his Apology, presented in 131 to the Emperor Hadrian, stayed, it is said, the course of that persecution; nor that Aristides, a Christian philosopher of the same city, who had addressed one to the same prince, five years before, in 125; nor even, which is still more to be regretted, that Philip,[2] bishop of Gortyna, who also wrote against Marcion; nor that Agrippa Castor, still more ancient, whom Eusebius calls most celebrated, (γνωριμώτατον,) and who composed, he says, twenty-four books on the Gospels.[3] "A most able refutation," (ἱκανώτατος ἔλεγχος,) published by him about the year 132, against the exegetic books of Basilides, would, no doubt, have also furnished us with very copious quotations from the New Testament.

Yet we shall presently say a few words about these authors whose works are now lost, because the fragments Eusebius has preserved for us remarkably confirm, brief as they are, the testimony of Justin Martyr, and lead us to admire that beautiful and strong chain of testimonies which by successive links reaches from Origen to the apostles.

[1] Mentioned by Eusebius, H. E., iv., 23, and by Jerome, De Scriptor. Illustr., cap. 27. [2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iv., 25. [3] Book vi., ch. vii., &c., ch. xxv.

201. Nevertheless, if, by the loss of these literary monuments, Justin presents himself to us in this important period as an almost isolated witness, it would be difficult to imagine one better qualified. We shall not repeat here what we have already said on the subject of *anagnosis*, (Prop. 161.) His career embraces the first sixty-seven years of the second century, and more especially the thirty-four years which elapsed from his conversion till his martyrdom. The son of a Greek family resident in Samaria, Justin was born at Neapolis (the ancient Shechem) under the reign of Trajan, in the same year in which the apostle John died. He was so near the days of the apostles, that in his time, as he said himself, the prophetic Charisms still existed. Thirty years afterwards, converted in Egypt from the pagan philosophy of Plato to the living faith of Jesus Christ, at the end of seven years he established himself in Italy—in Rome itself—on Mount Viminal, to give lectures on what he called "the Christian philosophy." There, in the year 144, he had the courage to present to the emperor, to his son, and to the Roman senate, his first and most important Apology.[1] At a later period, having removed to Asia Minor, he held in the Xystus of Ephesus that apologetic conference with the most celebrated Jew of his time, which he published under the title of "A Dialogue with Trypho the Jew." He went back to Italy to continue his public teaching, and, in the year 163,—that is to say, twenty-three years after his first Apology, —he published the second, addressed to Marcus Aurelius. At last, four years after this fresh act of Christian fidelity, Justin, brought before the Prefect of Rome by the wicked machinations of Crescens, the Cynic philosopher, suffered martyrdom in 167. At that time Clement of Alexandria was but seventeen, and Irenæus had only attained his forty-seventh year.

Justin wrote much. Eusebius,[2] who gives the titles of ten of his works, and recommends them to be read to the men of his time, adds that they were worthy of attention even to the ancients, (σπουδῆς ἄξιοι καὶ τοῖς παλαιοῖς,) and that Irenæus was fond of quoting them. Other writings of Justin which Eusebius has not

[1] The *longest*, which the old editions of Paris, 1636, and Cologne, 1686, print after the other. In the edition of London, 1722, it is placed first, [and in Otto's, Jena, 1847.]

[2] Hist. Eccl., iv., 18.

named were circulated also among a great number of the brethren, (*πλεῖστα δὲ καὶ ἕτερα παρὰ πολλοῖς φέρεται ἀδελφοῖς τῶν αὐτοῦ πόνων.*) Before he became a Christian, he had studied very ardently the different systems of philosophy propagated in his time, and was, above all, devoted to that of the Platonists, and after his conversion he continued to hold this human wisdom in higher esteem than became, in our opinion, a minister of the divine word. We know that he adhered all his life to the dress and manners of the philosophers. This was a means of recommending himself to the Greeks, and also of escaping the violence of a persecuting government. Yet, in his writings, he censures those Christians who concealed their faith to save their lives, and he himself did not conceal it when he was called to confess it before the Prefect of Rome. Belonging both to the East and West, he professed Christianity twenty years in Rome, after having been personally known among the most celebrated churches at that time in Africa, Europe, and Asia. He wrote against the unbelievers from among the pagans who persecuted the Church, against the Jews, who stirred them up, and against the heretics, who, with much boldness, made themselves conspicuous at Rome. He had, more than any other persons, the means of being well-informed, and consequently, he was eminently qualified to be listened to as representing the opinions of his age.

Let us now admire how abundantly the three only writings of his which remain to us render testimony to the Scriptures, and especially to the Gospels.

202. And, first, as to the Scriptures in general, he declares distinctly, under various forms of expression, their moral excellence and Divine inspiration. In his *Dialogue with Trypho*,[1] we may hear him give his own account of his happy transition from darkness to light.

For a long time he had sought in vain for peace of mind and the truth of God in all the Greek philosophies, when at last he met, in a lonely spot, with a venerable old man, who discoursed with him of the sacred books, written, as he said, by men who were friends of God, who spoke by the Divine Spirit, (*θείῳ πνεύ-*

[1] Edit. Cologne, 1686, pp. 224, 225. Opera, ed. Otto, Jena, 1848; tom. i., pars. ii., p. 30.

ματι λαλήσαντες,) and who had uttered predictions that were still in process of acomplishment. They alone, he added, had seen the truth, and declared it to men—not fearing any man, not seeking their own glory, and speaking only of things which they had seen and heard, having been filled with the Holy Spirit, (ἁγίῳ πληρωθέντες πνεύματι.) . . . . . And, moreover, they were most worthy of being believed on account of the miracles they performed. They glorified God the Father, the Creator of all things, and Christ His Son, whom He had sent. "But," added the aged Christian, "above all things pray that the gates of light may be opened to thee, (Εὔχου δέ σοι πρὸ πάντων φωτὸς ἀνοιχθῆναι πύλας,) for these things are not understood by all; but only by men to whom God and His Christ grant the knowledge of them." Justin prayed, and the gates of light were opened to him. "Then I found," he says, "that this is the only certain and profitable philosophy, (Ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ καὶ σύμφορον.) It is thus, and by these means that I am a philosopher, (Οὕτως δὴ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα φιλόσοφος ἐγώ.) And I wish that all agreeing in heart with me would not stand aloof from the words of the Saviour (μὴ ἀφίστασθαι τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος λόγων,) for they have in them something that inspires awe; they are sufficient to abash those who turn out of the right way, and the sweetest rest ensues to those who meditate on them, (ἀνάπαυσίς τε ἡδίστη γίνεται τοῖς ἐκμελετῶσιν αὐτούς.)" And, further, when Trypho assured him that he had been deceived: "I will prove to you," he said, "if you will listen to me, that we have not believed vain fables, nor undemonstrable words, (οὐ δὲ ἀναποδείκτοις λόγοις,) but words full of the Divine Spirit, teeming with power, and exuberant with grace, (ἀλλὰ μεστοῖς πνεύματος θειου καὶ δυνάμει βρύουσι, καὶ τεθηλόσι χάριτι.)" He then appeals distinctly to the internal excellence of the New Testament to establish our faith in its divinity.

So again, in the same Dialogue,[1] Justin, speaking to the Jews of those passages of Scripture which prove the divinity of our Saviour, says, "Pay attention to those words, from the Holy Scriptures, I am about to mention, which do not require to be

[1] Page 274. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 178, ed. Otto.

explained, but only to be heard, (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν οὐδὲ ἐξηγηθῆναι δεομένων, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἀκουσθῆναι.*)"

Further on,[1] he speaks of "the absurdity of those who think themselves able to produce anything better than the Scriptures, (*ἀλλ' ἡγεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν βέλτιον τῆς γραφῆς γεννήσαντα εἰπεῖν.*)"

Elsewhere,[2] after having represented to the Gentiles how little confidence could be put in their philosophers, who all contradicted one another, he shews them, on the contrary, the great harmony of our sacred writers. "For having received," he says, "the knowledge which comes from God, they teach us it without strife, and without party-spirit. In fact," he adds, "it is not possible for men to know such great and divine things by nature, or by human thought, but by a gift at that time descending from on high on holy men of God, (*οὔτε γὰρ φύσει οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γινώσκειν ἀνθρώπους δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας τήνικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾷ.*)"

We see, then, it is not to tradition, but to Divine grace, to the influence of the Holy Spirit received by each individual, that Justin appeals as to the interpretation of the Scriptures. "O men!" he exclaims in his Dialogue, "do you think that we should ever have understood these things in the Scriptures unless, by the will of Him who has been pleased to give them, we had received the grace of understanding them, (*εἰ μὴ θελήματι τοῦ θελήσαντος αὐτὰ ἐλάβομεν χάριν τοῦ νοῆσαι.*)"[3]

And in his *Discourse to the Greeks:* "Come and be instructed; *be as I am, for I also was as you are.*"[4] In the Greek these are the express words of Paul to the Galatians, (iv. 12.) "These are the things that elevated me—the inspiration of the doctrine, and the power of the word, (*Ἔλθετε, παιδεύθητε γενεσθε ὡς ἐγώ ὅτι κἀγὼ ἤμην ὡς ὑμεῖς. Ταῦτα με εἶλε, τό τε τῆς παιδείας ἔνθεον, καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου δυνατόν.*) "The Divine Word (*ὁ θεῖος Λόγος*) was that," he exclaimed, "which put to flight my evil passions; the doctrine was that which extinguished the fire of my soul!"

203. In the second place, we have already seen[5] that the books of Justin only thirty-seven years after the death of John, attested

[1] Pp. 311, 312. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 296, ed. Otto.
[2] Exhortation to the Gentiles, p. 9, ed. Cologne. Tom. ii., p. 38, ed. Otto.
[3] Opera, tom. i., para. ii., p. 398, ed. Otto. [4] Tom. ii., p. 14. [5] Prop. 160.

solemnly in the name of the whole contemporaneous Church, and before the emperor and senate of Rome, the public use which the Christians throughout the world then made of the apostolic Scriptures in their assemblies for worship.[1] It was in the year 140 that Justin had heard them read every Sunday at Rome, in Egypt, Palestine, Asia Minor, and Greece. "The Memoirs of the apostles, or Gospels, are read," he says, "every Sunday in the town and in the country; they are read with the books of the prophets;[2] and in every assembly, after they have been read, the president (ὁ προεστώς) makes them the subject of his exhortations."

These *Memoirs of the Apostles*, of which Justin Martyr speaks three times to the Emperor Antoninus in his Apology, could not be better described to a pagan stranger. We should do just the same in the present day if we addressed a defence of Christianity to the king of Siam or the emperor of Burmah. But Justin takes care to add twice that these memoirs were called Gospels, and that the apostles were their authors. "At that time,"[3] he says, "an angel of God, sent to the Virgin, announced the good news to her, saying, Behold, thou shalt conceive by the Holy Spirit, and shalt bear a son, and he shall be called Son of the Highest; and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins, as those have taught who have written[4] memoirs on all the things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ, and whom we have believed."[5] And again, explaining further on to the same emperor our holy supper, he says, "For the apostles, in the Memoirs composed by them and called Gospels,[6] have informed us that Jesus instituted that ordinance: Having taken bread and given thanks, he said, Do this in remembrance of me."

In the same manner, in his Dialogues, Justin speaks fifteen

[1] First Apology, § 67, (Edit. Bened., Paris, 1742.) P. 98, ed. Cologne, 1686. Tom. i., para. i., p. 158, ed. Otto.

[2] Καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ.

[3] P. 75, B, ed. Cologne. Tom. i., para. i., p. 86, ed. Otto.

[4] He combines, in fact, the narrative in Luke i. 31 and in Matt. i. 20, 21.

[5] Ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα, τὰ περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν.

[6] A καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια, that is, this is the common name of these Memoirs among the churches.

times of the Memoirs of the apostles, but takes care to repeat ten times that they were written by the apostles. He even goes so far as to make a more precise distinction between those Gospels which had apostles, properly so called, for their authors, as Matthew or John, and those which (such as the two Gospels of Luke and Mark) were composed by their companions. "In the Memoirs,"[1] he writes, "which I have said were composed by the apostles, and by those who accompanied them, it is written that the sweat fell from Him like drops of blood while He prayed and said, Let this cup pass from me." And the distinction which Justin makes is so much more worthy of attention because not one of the various spurious Gospels which were given to the world in the second century ever professed to be the work of "a companion of the apostles."

Lastly, Trypho the Jew himself also knew our Gospels, for he said to Justin, "I know that your precepts, contained *in what is called the Gospel*,[2] are so great and admirable that no one can observe them, for I have myself taken care to meet with them."[3]

We have entered into so many details in order to anticipate the difficulties which an eager negative criticism in Germany has attempted to raise against these testimonies of Justin.

We shall say a few more words about it presently.

204. In the third place, the books of Justin, though all three were addressed to men hostile to Christianity, present, compared with their size, an extraordinary abundance of quotations from the Gospels. We have counted fifty in his Apology, and more than seventy in his Dialogue. But the quotations are evidently almost all taken from our three synoptical Gospels, and report with many of the details, the facts of the life and death of the Saviour, and also the greater part of His moral teachings. This was his rational task in a defence of Christianity. It was necessary to shew to his opponents in all the facts relating to Christ the striking accomplishment of ancient prophecies, and in the in-

[1] Ἐν τοῖς ἀπομν . . . . ἃ φήμι ὑπό τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντέταχθαι.

[2] Ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγελματα.—P. 227, ed. Cologne. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 38, ed. Otto.

[3] Ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐμελησεν ἐντυχεῖν αὐτοῖς.

comparable excellence of His teachings, the Divine character of a religion that had descended from on high. And this is what directed him in the choice of quotations; he took them almost exclusively (as we have just said) from our three synoptic Gospels; that of John (the *spiritual Gospel*, as it has been called) being too profound to be often cited in an Apology addressed to pagans or Jews. Notwithstanding this, many of Justin's expressions recall to us a reader of St John; he even goes so far as to name this apostle and his Apocalypse.[1] "There is also among us," he says to Trypho, "a man of the name of John, an apostle of Jesus Christ, who, in a revelation (*apocalypse*) made to him, has prophesied that those who have believed in our Christ will live a thousand years in Jerusalem." But Justin's principal citations are taken from Matthew and Luke; they are made with freedom, and often in long passages. Being addressed to pagans and Jews, he was not obliged to a literal exactitude, provided he gave the true sense. In these 120 quotations you never find a single passage which has a legendary taint, or which could be referred to some apocryphal Gospel. They are all reminiscences of our Gospels; he knows only what these know; he reports only what these have reported—the infancy of Jesus according to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, His descent from Abraham by Mary,[2] the sending of the angel Gabriel, the accomplishment of the prophecy of Isaiah, (vii. 14,) the vision that appeared to Joseph to prevent his putting away his wife, the prediction of Micah about Bethlehem, the enrolment, the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, Cyrenius, the inn, the stable, the manger, the Magi, their offerings and adoration, the name of *Saviour* given to the holy infant, the flight into Egypt, the massacre of the infants, the prophecy of Jeremiah on the lamentation of Rachel, Archelaus, the return from Egypt, the thirty years of Jesus, all the history of John the Baptist, the Elias who was to come, the baptism of Jesus, His temptation in the wilderness, His miracles of healing, the dancing of the daughter of Herodias, and the death of the prophet. . . . .

[1] Ἔπειτα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης . . . . ἐν Ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ . . . . προεφήτευσε.

[2] Ἐξ ὧν, he says, κατάγει ἡ Μαρια το γένος.—*Dial.*, c. 100, 120. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 340, ed. Otto.

Justin also, in his Dialogue, relates with the same fulness the closing scenes of our Lord's ministry,—His triumphal entrance into Jerusalem accomplishing a prophecy, His visit to the temple, the institution of the Supper, the singing of a hymn, the three disciples taken apart, the prayers and agony of Gethsemane, the bloody sweat, the coming of Judas, the flight of the disciples, the silence of Jesus before Pilate, His being sent to Herod, the cross, the division of the garments by casting lots, the taunts,[1] the cry of Jesus, His last words, His burial on the evening of Friday, His resurrection on Sunday,[2] His shewing himself, His explanation of the Scriptures to the apostles, the calumnies of the Jews, the commission given to the apostles,[3] the ascension.

Yet the most copious quotations of Justin have for their object the teachings of the Saviour. We find, for example, among them, almost the whole of the Sermon on the Mount, His calls to repentance, His directions to the seventy disciples, His words on the sign of Jonah, on the value of the soul, on marriage, on the tribute to Cæsar, on the false teachers, on the resurrection, on chastity, on the love of enemies, on the future punishment of the wicked, on the scribes and Pharisees, on His own divinity. "It is written in the Gospel, All things have been delivered to me by the Father, and no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and no one knoweth the Son but the Father, and those to whom the Son shall reveal him."[4]

In his larger Apology,[5] to shew the admirable morality of the Scriptures, he cites a good part of the Sermon on the Mount. "If ye love them that love you, what new thing do ye do? for even fornicators do this. But I say unto you, Pray for your enemies, love them who persecute you, bless," &c. And on the duty of giving away our property, and doing nothing for one's own glory, he adds, "Christ says, Give to them that ask you, and turn not away. And as for you, treasure not up for yourselves treasure upon earth, where moth and rust corrupt. . . . And what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul," &c.

Besides these extended citations, we find many passages in

[1] And in the Apology, i., 38. [2] Ibid., i., 69. [3] Ibid., i., 50.
[4] Dial., p. 326. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 340. [5] Page 23.

Justin which call to our recollection other books of the New Testament. His part as an apologist does not require him to speak of the Acts of the Apostles, or of Paul's Epistles; but his language often reminds us in passing that his mind had been nourished by them. Thus, in relation to the Epistle to the Colossians, (i. 15–17,) he calls Jesus Christ in four or five different places, *the first-born of God, the first-born of all creatures, He who was before all creatures,*[1] (*τὸν πρωτότοκον τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων, πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων.*) So it is with the Epistle to the Romans: he shews that Abraham, being yet uncircumcised, was justified on account of his faith in which he believed God, (*ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ὢν διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ, ἐδικαιώθη,*)[2] and thus it is that he cites his description of the moral misery of all men, Jews and Greeks:[3] "They are all gone out of the way; they are all become unprofitable; there is none that understandeth, not one; their throat is an open sepulchre," &c.

Thus, again, with the Epistle to the Corinthians, (1 Cor. v. 7,) he says that *Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed for us,*[4] and complains of some *saying that there is no resurrection of the dead.* So it is with the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, (ii. 3,) he speaks of Christ, who will come from heaven in glory, when also the man of apostasy, (*ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἄνθρωπος,*) the man of sin, who utters strange things and blasphemies against the Most High, will manifest his audacious iniquity against us Christians.[5]

And thus with the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says of Christ *that He is the Son and Apostle of God,*[6] and, in his Dialogue,[7] *that He is according to the order of Melchisedec, King of Salem, and perpetual Priest of the Most High.*

It is thus with the Epistle to Titus, (iii. 4,) and the Epistle to the Romans, employing the remarkable expressions of the apostle, he speaks of the goodness and philanthropy of God, and the

[1] Apol., i., 46, ii., 6. Dial., pp. 310, 311, 326. Paris, 1636. Tom. i., pars. ii., p. 292, ed. Otto. [2] Dial., ch. xxiii. [3] Rom. iii. 11, 12.
[4] Dial., pp. 338, 339. Tom. i., pars. ii., p. 374, ed. Otto. [5] Dial., p. 338.
[6] *Καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος.* This name is nowhere given to him except in Heb. iii. i. [7] Dial., p. 341. Tom. i., pars. ii., p. 382, ed. Otto.

abundance of his riches, (ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ.)[1] It is thus that, in his address and exhortation to the Gentiles, we find allusions to the Acts, and the Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Colossians. It is thus, in a word, that we observe many remarkable coincidences between Justin and Paul, on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Timothy, as also to the Galatians and Ephesians, in their common quotations from the Septuagint. In a word, we may say that, with the exception of the catholic epistles, and the Epistle to Philemon, there is no book of the first canon of which some trace may not be found in this ancient father.

205. Still, to be able to appreciate duly all the value of his testimony, we must not forget that, of all his works, we possess only, complete and authentic, his two Apologies and his Dialogue —all three addressed, not to Christians, but to unbelievers. All his other numerous writings, composed for the members of the Church, are almost entirely lost. These would doubtless have furnished us with a testimony far more abundant and precise; for he lived many years in the same city as the three greatest leaders of the contemporary heresies, and combated them.[2]

If we possessed the treatise he wrote against Marcion, of which Eusebius[3] tells us, or the lost portion of his book on the Monarchy of God, we should certainly have many more numerous quotations by him from the New Testament. Of this last-named work Eusebius tells us that the author proved his thesis by passages taken *from our Scriptures*, (ἐκ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν γραφῶν,) but this portion has been lost.

Two features especially distinguish his three apologetic treatises from those of his books which have not come down to our time.

And, in the first place, these three treatises, and more especially the Dialogue, must needs quote the Old Testament much more frequently than the New. We may count, it is said, 314 quotations of the Old Testament against 120 of the New. This was quite natural; for, in analogous circumstances, we should have acted just as he has done. If you are speaking to Jews, the Old Testa-

[1] Dial., p. 266. Tom. i., pars. ii., p. 154, ed. Otto.
[2] Cerdo, Marcion, and Valentine.
[3] Cap. xxxvii., Hist. Eccl., iv. 18, (pp. 140, 141, ed. Valesius, 1672.)

ment alone is an authority; and you quote the New merely to shew them that it fulfils Moses and the prophets. If you are speaking to pagans, still it is by the Old Testament that you prove to them the high antiquity of revelation, and its divine superiority above all the teachings of their philosophers regarding the origin, the duties, and the destiny of mankind. This was the method, a hundred years before Justin, of Philo and the Jewish school at Alexandria, in their controversies with the pagan world; as it was, after him, that of Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria.

A second feature which must characterise the quotations of Justin in his apologetic writings is, that they are made under designations less precise than would be employed in addressing Christian churches. We might expect that he would scarcely ever indicate the authors by their proper names; that what Christians called Gospels he would call Memoirs of the apostles; that he would cite them from memory; that he would faithfully give the sense without believing himself always bound to the same expressions; that he would condense, combine, or transpose certain sentences; that he would often join two passages in one quotation; and that if he repeated several times the same sentence from the Gospels, he would repeat it without feeling himself bound to quote it every time in the same terms. But, in the course of all these liberties, he would preserve the characteristics and the phraseology of the New Testament, without using any foreign element, any apocryphal recital, any trace of contemporary legends. This is what Justin has done.

206. It is necessary to understand why we have entered into all these explanations respecting this father, which might at first sight seem superfluous. His testimony is of such great importance from its antiquity, from the extent and copiousness of his citations from the Gospels, and from the perfect authenticity of the books which transmit it to us, that it might be expected the modern opponents of our canonical scriptures would not neglect any means of weakening it. This is what they have done, especially in Germany. No one till these latter days has called in question the very clear and numerous testimonies which Justin gives to our synoptic Gospels; but the negative criticism of modern Neologism,

by studying with the greatest care the hundred and twenty clear and full quotations made by this father, by collecting all the expressions which differ ever so little from the text of Scripture, by finding fault with all the liberties of citation which Justin has allowed himself, and by exaggerating the difficulties,—this criticism, we say, has gone the length of asserting that he had not our four Gospels before him, but some other document: according to some, a certain primitive Gospel from which our four evangelists have drawn their fourfold narrative; according to others, the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews, as it is called; according to others, a *harmony* or combined narrative of our canonical Gospels; and, lastly, according to Credner, *a Gospel according to St Peter*, which, under different forms, was circulated among the Jewish Christians.

Great exertions have been made in Germany to uphold these strange hypotheses, and great exertions to put them down;[1] and thus the study of Justin has been completed with great exactness. We shall not enlarge further in this controversy.[2] There are in the path of the defenders of the Holy Word serious objections which must be met at all times; but there are others which have only a special place and time, and do not need to be refuted with fulness except in their own time and place. The objections we have just noticed are, as we think, of this class. They have made a noise, but they have also done too much violence to historical statements to be repeated. How can it be maintained that Justin employed apocryphal Gospels at the very time when, close by his side, in the same city of Rome, the heretic Valentine made use only of our four evangelists and a complete canon, (*integro instrumento,*) as Tertullian[3] affirms? How—when, at the very time, he declared to the emperor that the Gospels, or Memoirs of the apostles,—memoirs without doubt known and fixed,—were read every Sunday in all the churches of the empire? How—when

[1] See and compare Semisch's Denkwürdigkeiten Justins, (Hamburg, 1848;) Credner's Beiträge, i., 92-267, (Halle, 1832;) Schwegler Nachapostolische Zeitalter, i., 217-231.

[2] Semisch has treated it with ability, p. 16-33. We may also find it explained and discussed in Mr Westcott's learned work on the canon, entitled, "A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament; Cambridge, 1855."

[3] De Praescript. Haereticor., cap. xxxviii.

they were everywhere so known, that Trypho the Jew, when Justin named them to him, knew them, and said he had read them? How —at a time when Irenæus, then at Lyons in the prime of life, constantly spoke of the quadriform Gospel, (*τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον,*) as a whole, unique of its kind, and everywhere acknowledged with incomparable constancy, (*tanta est circa evangelium haec firmitas neque autem plura numero quam haec sunt, neque rursus pauciora capit esse evangelia?*)[1] How—when we recollect that Irenæus, on betaking himself to Lyons, had passed through Rome during Justin's long sojourn there, and that he returned thither about the year 177, ten years only after the martyrdom of that father, in order to visit Bishop Eleutherus? How, again, can it be supposed that Justin made use, for his two Apologies, of Gospels which were not the same? How can it be supposed that he and Irenæus used different Gospels? How can we imagine that the immediate disciples of Justin and all the Church spoke of a collection different from his in precisely the same terms? How can it be pretended that, in so short a time, an immense revolution took place in the Christian world unperceived, and was effected without leaving the slightest trace? How can we suppose that all the churches consented, without any noise, at this epoch to change their sacred books all over the world, so that those which were read publicly every Sunday in the year 140 were not the same in 167, when Justin died, though they were still designated by the same expressions? Certainly nothing can more deplorably betray the forlorn condition of a system, than the attempt to prop it up by such impossible suppositions.

SECTION SECOND.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

207. We shall say only a very few words on the three principal objections alleged by our opponents when they maintain that Justin in his 120 quotations had before him different Gospels

[1] Contra Haeres., lib. iii., cap. ii. The whole passage shews, says Olshausen, (Aechtheit d. 4 can. Evang., p. 272,) that Irenæus absolutely could not have known a time when there was not a collection of the Gospels.

from our own.[1] In the first place, they say, though Justin once [2] names the apostle John as author of the Apocalypse, he never designates Matthew, Mark, or Luke by their proper names, even when he quotes at length their own words, such as we read in their respective Gospels. But we reply, that such a mention of their names would have been out of place in such a work; none of the other apologists who came after him ever did it; neither Tatian, the disciple of Justin, nor Athenagoras, nor even Tertullian in his "*Apologeticus*," who names them so often in his other writings, nor Theophilus of Antioch in his books to "Autolycus," nor Clement of Alexandria in his "Exhortation to the Gentiles," nor Cyprian in his treatise "Ad Demetrianum," nor Origen in his books against Celsus, nor Lactantius, nor Arnobius, nor even Eusebius in his *Evangelica Praeparatio*. Theophilus and Clement, like Justin, have named only St John, and like him but once. Lactantius goes to the length of blaming Cyprian for having quoted Scripture in a controversy with a pagan.[3]

In the second place, they say, see the extreme liberty with which Justin makes his quotations from the Gospels; he quotes them from memory; often if he gives the sense it is in other phrases, or by abridging and combining them. But the reply to this is as simple as it is decisive; and it is sufficient in order to give it to study this author more closely. This is what Semisch and Credner have done in comparing with the citations from the New Testament by Justin, those which the same father has taken from Moses and the prophets. But it is absolutely the same liberty whether in the Apology or in the Dialogue with Trypho. You may read in these authors more than sixty passages where you will see Justin treat the Old Testament in the same manner as he has done the New—giving passages from memory, paraphrasing them in order to make them clearer, transposing or combining them, and paying more attention to the sense than to the words. In like manner, when he cites them on different occasions, it is with

[1] Semisch has examined these strange hypotheses with ability, in his Denkwürdigkeiten Justins, (Hamb., 1848.) The whole controversy has been handled with much care in the learned work of Mr Westcott on the Canon of the New Testament. He has made use, in a very luminous manner, of the labours of German writers, (pp. 112–216.)

[2] In his Dialogue, p. 308. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 282, ed. Otto. [3] Instit., v., 4.

remarkable verbal alterations in order to apply them with more force to his object. If, then, he thus cites Moses and the prophets, so well known to the Jewish people, why should he cite otherwise the apostles and evangelists?

Lastly, a third objection is founded on the following words, which Justin cites as if uttered by Jesus Christ, and which are not found in our gospels:—"Our Lord," he writes in the 47th chapter of his Dialogue with Trypho, "has said, *In what things I convict you, in them I will also judge you;*"[1] and in chap. 35, "Christ has said, *there shall be schisms and heresies.*" We reply (1.) that neither of these sentences can be found in any of the apocryphal Gospels; (2.) that Justin says not a word here of having read them in the Memoirs of the apostles; (3.) we need not be astonished if this father, writing a very few years after John's death, while there remained unwritten remembrances of the words of Christ, recited traditionally this sentence of the Lord, as Paul himself recited that which we read in the 20th chapter of the Acts, and which is not to be found in the Gospels, "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, *It is more blessed to give than to receive.*"

208. In a word, it is beyond all doubt that in the year 140 of the Christian era, Justin, in his Apology, and a few years after in his Dialogue, cites with extreme copiousness our synoptic Gospels, declaring them to be written by apostles of Christ, and companions of the apostles; and informing the Roman emperor that every Sunday all the Christians throughout the world read them publicly with the writings of the Old Testament in their public assemblies, before offering their prayers to God, celebrating the supper, and receiving the alms of the faithful.

[1] Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ. Some persons have seen in this expression a paraphrase of those words of our Lord, "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together." Three others have been adduced which are disputable. See Kirchhofer, Quellensammlung, &c., p. 104.

Section Third.

OTHER HISTORICAL MONUMENTS OF THE CANON IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

209. Justin, moreover, is not the sole witness of this epoch. Though he is the only one of the fathers of whom any writings have come down to us entire and authentic, yet we find in Eusebius many traces of other writers of the same period who, in passing, bear witness to the canon, and who, bringing us back for a moment to the banks of that stream to whose source we are remounting, allow us to see it again still majestic, and thus to appreciate by a glance the distinguished place the sacred collection of the Scriptures already held in the usages of the people of God.

Thus, for example, in his third book, chap. 37, Eusebius tells us that, under the reign of Trajan, at the beginning of the second century, in the remote days of the minister and martyr Ignatius, and when that Quadratus flourished in the Church "who had received miraculous charisms with the daughters of Philip," "a great number of the disciples rendered themselves celebrated among the first successors of the apostles by going forth to spread through the whole earth the salutary seeds of the kingdom of heaven." "The majority of them," he adds, "having had, by the divine Word, (*πρὸς τοῦ θείου λόγου,*) the soul penetrated with an ardent love of the (true) philosophy, (*σφοδροτέρῳ φιλοσοφίας ἔρωτι τὴν ψυχὴν πλητόμενοι,*) followed the exhortation of the Lord by distributing their goods to the poor; then, abandoning their country and setting out on their travels, they fulfilled the work of evangelists among those who had never heard the word of faith, because they were ambitious to announce Christ, and to transmit the scripture of the divine Gospels, (*καὶ τὴν τῶν θείων εὐαγγελίων παραδιδόναι γραφήν.*)"

Thus you see these holy men of God, at the beginning of the second century, successors and imitators of the apostles, at the period when John was himself bearing the testimony of Jesus Christ in the province of Asia, at Ephesus, and when the charisms of the Spirit still accompanied the preaching of the gospel, you see them travelling with *the scriptures of the divine Gospels* in

their hands, carrying them into barbarous countries, (ἐπὶ ξένοις τισὶ τόποις.) You see them not only penetrated in their own souls by the divine Word, as Eusebius says, but leaving it behind them in writing, and "transmitting" it to these distant populations. So also Eusebius [1] informs us that Pantænus, when he penetrated into India towards the end of the second century, found that the Gospel of Matthew had preceded his arrival almost a hundred years, having been left written in Hebrew letters (Ἑβραίων γράμμασι) by Bartholomew, one of the twelve, and had been the means of bringing a certain number of men there to the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

By this recital of Eusebius we are again brought to the margin of the Scriptures, and ascend nearly to the point where its beneficent and pure current first escaped from the apostolic lake, to receive yet some additional streams, and soon to proceed, complete and majestic, to carry its living waters to all the nations of the earth.

It is sufficiently evident that Eusebius here speaks of definite and acknowledged Gospels which had not been changed on their way; in a word, of the Gospels which from his days have been reverenced by the whole Christian world.

210. But if by various accidents only so small a number of the monuments of the fathers of the second century remain to us, the providence of God has provided others still more important, and, perhaps, more indisputable. They have been left to us by the most violent enemies of these same fathers. Their testimony will speak to us in stronger accents, since it was involuntary, and will render service to the gospel in the present day in spite of all the hatred that these men bore to it. They little suspected, these unbelievers of the two first centuries, that even their attacks would serve in the most remote ages to confound those who resembled them. In almost all their features they were like the men of the nineteenth century, whose systems they now overturn, and it is by them that the holy convictions of the primitive Church on the subject of the canon are most strongly attested to us against all the negations of modern unbelief.

These opponents in the age of Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus

[1] Hist. Eccl., v., 10.

Pius, were of two sorts: the one, unbelievers among Jews and pagans, calumniated the Church from without; the others, heretics among the Ebionites and Gnostics, harassed it within by doctrinal errors in the name of what they called with self-laudation Gnosis or Science,—"Science falsely so called," (ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως,) said the apostle Paul.[1]

But it must be remarked that, as ordinarily happens, the enemy excited this double war of unbelievers and heretics at the time of the greatest progress of the gospel. It was also in making this attack, so audacious and so violent, that these men left behind them, in the literature of their age, such precious monuments of the canon. Their distant attempts have again led us to the banks of the river, though they were occupied only in troubling the waters with their feet, and rendering them turbid; but these very attempts, contrary to their expectations, have turned to the honour of the Scriptures. Not only will they serve to establish their course in the second century, but we shall see all the contemporary churches reverently stationed on the same banks, to guard the stream, and to draw with eagerness the waters that spring up to everlasting life.

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 20.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TESTIMONY OF PAGAN UNBELIEVERS IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

SECTION FIRST.

THEIR WRITINGS.

211. THE first enemies of Christianity, in order to find subjects of accusation, applied themselves to the study of the Scriptures, boasting that they should thus "destroy it with its own weapons;" and by this attempt they have supplied us, even in their most violent writings, with a splendid acknowledgment of our collection, and of the authority, already established, which it enjoyed in their time throughout all the churches. "All these things, which we object to you," said the Jew of Celsus, *ὁ Κέλσου*, (a Jewish opponent whom Celsus brings forward as speaker in his famous book against Christianity,)[1]—"all these things we take from your own Scriptures, (*ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων συγγραμάτων*;) and, fortified by these quotations, we have no need of any witnesses against you but yourselves; for you will thus fall into your own snare, (*αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς περιπίπτετε.*)"

The writings of these ancient adversaries exist no longer; but many of the works composed to refute them having come down to us furnish an unanswerable testimony; and, under this form, we may say that the ancient defenders of the gospel have, perhaps, been of more service to it by their quotations than by their arguments. In this way almost all the objections of Celsus are repro-

[1] His *Λόγος Ἀληθής*. The book has been lost, but copious citations are to be found in Origen's "Refutation of Celsus."

duced by Origen; many of those of Amelius by Eusebius; and of those of Porphyry by Jerome and Chrysostom.

As Amelius and Porphyry belong rather to the third century, we shall speak here only of Celsus, who flourished in the first half of the second century, under the reign of Hadrian—that is to say, from 117 to 138.

Section Second.

TESTIMONY OF CELSUS.

212. Celsus (or rather Kelsos) was an Epicurean philosopher, full of burning hatred against the Christians. He knew how to wield with much vigour and ability all the weapons of argument and ridicule to disparage their leader, their doctrine, and their Scriptures. Origen, in his eight books against Celsus,[1] has made us acquainted with his writings without informing us of his exact age, or the place of his residence. We only know that he was more ancient than the famous unbeliever, Lucian of Samosata, who lived under the Antonines, and who dedicated to him one of his dialogues. Kirchhofer,[2] depending on a passage in which Celsus seems to him to speak of Marcion,[3] would place him later in the second century than we have done; but it is a mere conjecture on his part. Marcion is not named in the passage.

213. The testimony which Celsus bears to the canon of the Gospels is of very great weight from its remote age. Chrysostom, fifteen hundred years ago, directed the attention of the men of his times to the homage paid by this unbeliever to our sacred books. "Admire," he says, in his sixth homily on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, "how early the gospel has been propagated in all parts of the habitable globe; for Celsus, and after him, Porphyry, who have spoken so much against us, are sufficient witnesses of the antiquity of our sacred books, (*ἱκανοί . . . . τὴν ἀρχαιότητα μαρτυρῆσαι τοῖς βιβλίοις.*)"

Thus it came to pass that this opponent, at the beginning of

[1] The best edition is Spencer's; Cambridge, 1658; 4to. We generally quote from the Benedictine edition of Origen's works; 4 vols. folio, 1733–1759.

[2] Quellensammlung, &c., p. 331.

[3] Origen against Celsus, book ii., ch. xxvii., (Opp., tom. i.)

the second century, like Voltaire and the English Deists in the eighteenth, through his hatred of the Scriptures, set himself to study in a certain manner their character and contents. The way in which he has spoken of our four Gospels, and of no other, evidently shews, Kirchhofer[1] observes, that he not only knew them under this title, but attributed them to the disciples of Jesus, and that, in his time, they were used universally in the Christian churches. He never makes an objection to their authenticity; and we may be sure that, however little it would have been possible to call it in question in his time, had there been the slightest ground for so doing, such a man would not have failed to seize with both hands so powerful a weapon. But it never entered his thoughts. On the contrary, as we have said, he boasts of quoting them "to beat the Christians with their own weapons." In a word, the whole group of fragments preserved by Origen renders it in the highest degree probable that Celsus had read the collection of our four Gospels, and even that he had read no others. Thus not only Christians, but pagans themselves attest the universal dissemination of the sacred collection of the Gospels in the second century.

214. Celsus, in order to depreciate the character of Jesus, brings forward with great copiousness almost all the facts of His life, and the greater number of His words. The mere collection of these passages in Kirchhofer's work fills twenty-three pages; and you may recognise there, by turns and exclusively, each of our four evangelists, as well as many passages of Paul's epistles. And when he has cited all these facts of the birth, the life, the miracles, the discourses, the sufferings, the death, and resurrection of our Lord, he declares that he had taken them from the writings of the disciples of Jesus, (*τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γραφεῖσιν.*)[2] "I have taken them," he says elsewhere, "from *your own writings*, (*ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων συγγραμμάτων καθ' ἃ καὶ ὑμεῖς συγγεγράφατε.*)"[3]

For example, he represents Jesus as being, according to our Scriptures, the pretended son of a virgin, announced by angels, adored by the Magi, flying into Egypt, baptized by John, behold-

[1] Quellensammlung, &c., pp. 330, 333, 349.
[2] Origen, Contra Celsum, ii., 74. [3] II., 49, 74.

ing a dove descend at His baptism, &c., &c. He reproaches Him with having said, "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God;" with having said, "Behold the lilies of the field;" "behold the fowls of the air, they toil not, they spin not;" with having said, "If any one say to you, Christ is here, or he is there, believe him not;" with having said, "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, we have cast out demons in thy name, and in thy name have done wonderful works," &c.; "but I shall say unto them, Depart from me, ye that work iniquity." "O Light, O Truth," he exclaims, "hear Himself,—your own writings attest it, —hear Him with His own voice, informing us that others, although wicked, will perform the same miracles!"

But more than this, Celsus, in order to disparage our Gospels and set them in contradiction to one another, evidently points out those of Matthew and Luke as opposed to one another in their genealogies;[1] and elsewhere evidently alludes to the Gospel of John, describing how Christ shewed His disciples the scars in His hands and in His feet,[2]—speaking of the blood that flowed from His side,[3] of the earthquake and the darkness, reproaching Christians with calling Jesus the Son and Word of God, (*ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι αὐτολόγον,*) and Christ with saying to His disciples,[4] "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you;" and again, "If ye are persecuted in one city, flee you to another." "Wherefore didst thou flee hither and thither with thy disciples?" said the Jew of Celsus to Jesus. "Why, since a good general is never betrayed by his soldiers, nor even a brigand by the wretches of whom he is the chief—why did not Jesus gain from His disciples the same attachment?"[5] "Why did Jesus so bewail Himself in those words, 'My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me'"[6] "Why did He suffer so much from thirst, which often men of no account endure?"[7] "Why, when they offered Him gall and vinegar, did He swallow it with avidity?" "Why was He so ready to threaten and exclaim, 'Woe to you!—I say unto you?'" "Why, O Jesus, hadst thou

[1] II., 32. [2] II., 55. [3] II., 36–59. [4] I., 70.
[5] II., 12. [6] II., 24. [7] II., 37.

need in thy infancy of being warned by an angel, and carried into Egypt for fear of being killed?"

Lastly, Celsus marks equally all the four evangelists, when he opposes those who make one angel appear at the sepulchre (as Mark and Matthew) to those who (as Luke and John) make two appear at it, (*ὑπό τινων μὲν δύο, ὑπό τινων δὲ εἷς.*)[1] He even reproaches the Christians with making use of four; "for some of you believers," he says, "like drunken men who strike themselves with their own hands, have out of the first writing (or scripture) recarved and remodelled the Gospel three times, four times, and many times, that they may be able to refute arguments by denials.[2]

215. But yet Celsus has not confined his accusations to our four Gospels. He has extended them even to Paul's epistles. He has spoken, for example, of the prophecies which, in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and in the first to Timothy, refer to the great apostasy of the last days. "I think," says Origen, "that in these passages he has ill understood the apostolic language," (on 1 Tim. iv. 2.)

Moreover, he reproaches Christians with injuring one another, while they are heard saying, "The world is crucified to me, and I unto the world," (Gal. vi. 14.) "Celsus," says Origen,[3] "cannot bring forward these words but as a remembrance from Paul's epistles, (*τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ἔοικε μεμνημονεοκέναι ὁ Κέλσος.*)" "But I pass," Origen says elsewhere,[4] "to another accusation of Celsus, where, misunderstanding the Scriptures, he reproaches us with saying that what is wisdom among men is folly before God; while Paul has simply said, (1 Cor. iii. 19,) '*The wisdom of this world is folly before God.*'" And in another place, making an allusion to 1 Cor. viii. 11, he reproaches Christians for their conduct in reference to meats offered to idols. "Hear," says Origen,[5] "these words of Celsus. See his dilemma: —'If these idols are nothing, what is there so terrible (*τὶ δεινόν*) in taking part at our public festivals? And if there are really certain demons, then they are evidently demons of God, to whom

[1] V., 56.

[2] II., 27, *Μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ* Ε'ΥΑΓΓΕ'ΛΙΟΝ *τριχῆ καὶ τετραχῆ καὶ πολλαχῆ καὶ μεταπλάττειν, ἵν' ἐχοιεν πρὸς τοῖς ἐλέγχοις ἀρνεῖσθαι.* [3] V., 64. [4] VI., 12. [5] VIII., 24.

you ought to give faith and homage according to the laws, and whom you ought to invoke to render them propitious.'" "It will be useful," Origin adds, "to explain here the whole of the passage in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians on things sacrificed to idols."

Section Third.

Force of this testimony.

216. Let us stop here to consider carefully the whole force of the testimony rendered so near the death of St John to the canon of our sacred books. Observe, then, how this Voltaire of the second century confutes, without intending it, the men who attempt in the nineteenth to raise doubts against the existence of the canon in the second. Observe how he shews these doubts to be absurd, since he employs against the Christians *their own weapons*—these "Scriptures"—"Scriptures composed," he affirms, "by the disciples of Jesus"—those which all the world received as such, and on which the whole edifice of their faith was built—those of which no one, either among friends or foes, ever called in doubt the apostolic authenticity—those which were read every Sunday in all the churches throughout the world. Let any one only read the scriptural quotations of Celsus, all taken only from Origen's "Refutation." He will be struck with the irresistible power of this involuntary testimony, and tempted to say in his turn to these enemies of the Christians, (*οὐδενός ἄλλου μάρτυρος χρήζομεν,*) "We need no witness against you, O Celsus, but yourself!" And we have no need of other witnesses against your unbelieving brethren of the nineteenth century than yourself at the beginning of the second!

These quotations of Celsus, which might be easily multiplied, will suffice,[1] then, to prove abundantly the universal reception and authority of our sacred books in the first years of the second century, and, of course, their promulgation at a much earlier period; for Celsus everywhere assumes this anteriority. Our sacred books are represented to be as old as the Christian Church.

[1] See Celsus himself in the collection of the Benedictines, p. 71, note 1.

Celsus indicates not the slightest suspicion that it could be otherwise. The idea of calling in question their authority in the Christian Church, and their universally acknowledged authenticity, does not occur to his thoughts, for it could not then have entered any one's mind; and his hatred has recourse to very different accusations. Here are your Scriptures, on the contrary, he said in other words, you cannot deny them; the very disciples of your Master are their writers; but if I admit with you their apostolic authenticity, I shall proceed to point out to you their contradictions, their immoral sentiments, their notions borrowed from Plato, and their impossibilities. We see, then, that Celsus stoutly repudiates the whole modern system of attack by unbelievers against our canon: he shews them that it is destitute of all historic value, and that they must change it. And mark well, it would have been a more potent weapon for Celsus than all others against Christianity in its infancy and in its future, could he have raised the slightest doubt of the authenticity of our books; it would have overturned our religion from its foundation. But this weapon could not by any possibility be then used. The idea of employing it never occurred to Porphyry, to Amelius, or to Julian. And yet this thought of calling in question the authenticity of our sacred books, and the agreement of all the churches in the world to receive them, would have offered itself so much better to the hatred of Celsus, than if the twenty-two *homologoumena* were everywhere and always uncontroverted from the apostolic times. This was not the case with the five short late epistles, for the question respecting these books was not entirely decided, and the Christian teachers still studied it in a spirit of mutual respect, forbearance and peace. It does not signify. You find in no part of the Church a trace of doubt as to the first canon—its origin—its authority—the universal confidence it obtained—the continual use made of it by the churches in all their assemblies for worship. Certainly, then, it must be affirmed, if we had only the *True Discourse* (Λόγος Ἀληθής) of Celsus, or, rather, the fragments preserved by Origen, we should still be obliged to conclude from it that, at the beginning of the second century, the Christians had long been in possession of a sacred

collection of books, attributed to the apostles by their enemies themselves, and already made in all their churches the standard of their faith and the rule of their life.

We now pass on to the heretics—their testimony will be still more explicit; and this proof will be so ample that it will appear to surpass even that of the fathers, and that furnished by the enemies of the Church, for we shall listen to witnesses more ancient than either Justin Martyr or Celsus.

CHAPTER IX.

THE TESTIMONY OF HERETICS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

SECTION FIRST.

THE CHARACTER OF THIS TESTIMONY

217. THE heretics, whose unanimous voice is heard at this epoch, are not a small number, as was the case with the contemporary fathers. They are a host—a cloud of witnesses. Ancient authors have reckoned in those remote times as many as thirty-two heretical sects, differing very much in their dogmas, but very unanimous, as we shall see, in attesting for us the existence of the canon, and its authority in all the churches. And so great is the power of this proof, that in our day we have seen many German defenders of the canon [1] who have placed the main strength of their apology in it. This testimony is involuntary, since we owe it, like that of Celsus, to the most dangerous enemies of primitive Christianity. We must here admire how Providence makes use of such men, after 1700 years, in reducing to powder the negations of modern criticism. Behold these ancient enemies, the cause of so much trouble to the Church in its earlier days, now joining their voice to that of the fathers of the second century, to establish, against the rationalists of the nineteenth, the authenticity of our sacred books, and the divine authority attributed to them by all the Christian Churches throughout the world! "It is a fact worthy of our most serious consideration," says Hug, "that the depositions

[1] See their most recent introductions to the study of the New Testament, beginning with that of Hug, (Hug's Einleitung, prop. i., p. 88.)

of heretics, so accidentally preserved, attest not only the existence of the New Testament in the second century, but its anterior origin; for these depositions relate not merely to their own times; they mount much higher up, and attest that the apostles Peter, John, and Paul, were authors of our sacred writings." To have all the force which belongs to it, this proof would require a greater development of quotations than we could conveniently present here. The numerous writings of all these heretics have perished, like those of the unbelieving pagans of the same period; but we find most copious citations from them in the refutations written by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, and some others.

218. To behold all these heresies springing up in a time so close to the days of the apostles need not astonish or perplex our faith. Heresies germinate and flourish only in times of awakening and life. The whole history of God's people shews us that these departures from the truth have been more frequent when the churches have been most fervent and pure. St Paul goes so far as to say that they have their use in the government of God. "For there must be also heresies among you," he tells us, (1 Cor. xi. 19.) And he takes care to instruct the church of Corinth that God knows how to make use of this evil for the good of His people; because the very heresies which harass serve also to purify them. "Their word will eat as doth a canker," (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18,) he has said; but frequently they also perform in a church a similar office to that of leeches on a sick body—they draw off what ought not to remain in the system. Hence it results, the apostle says, "that those that are approved are made manifest among believers;" and they prove the elect. We are not, then, to be astonished at the great number of heretics in the second century, or even in the first. The gospel never spread itself over the world with so much power as in the days of Trajan and Hadrian, (from 98 to 138;) but never did such a multitude of monstrous sects invade the churches of God.

219. Irenæus, in his great work, has described in detail all those of his time; and the celebrated Hippolytus, thirty years after him, has passed them under review in his *Refutation*. He enumerates as many as thirty-two; four belonging to the *Ophites*,

who already, in the time of John, mixed their own prophecies with the Revelation; eleven of different *Gnostic* sects, given up in various ways to the worthless deceptions of a philosophy which they eulogised as *Gnosis* or *Science;*[1] twelve others belonging to the Ebionites, Judaising sects, who repudiated the doctrines of grace, and the divinity of Jesus Christ; others made up of Ebionism and Gnosticism; and, lastly, five others, who were in error chiefly on points of discipline, and who, at least, were orthodox as to the doctrine of God and His Christ.

220. But all these sects have borne a striking testimony to the canon of Scripture, chiefly in the following particulars:—

(1.) The majority of them, with all their errors, and the rashness of their modes of interpretation, acknowledged the authority of our sacred books. This was, for example, the case with the powerful host of the Valentinians, who formed alone six sects of Gnostics. This was the case also with the disciples of Carpocrates, and with those of Theodotus, who belonged rather to the Ebionite sects. "Valentine appears to have made use of a complete canon," said Tertullian,[2] (*Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur;*) and Irenæus satisfies himself with saying of this sect, that "it had a preference for the writings of John. They attempt," he adds, "to justify their errors by *apostolic and evangelic citations*, though they give perverted interpretations, and are unscrupulous in their exegesis, (*παρατρέποντες τὰς ἑρμηνείας, καὶ ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις.*)"

(2.) In the second place, even those heretics who allow themselves to reject part of the canon, render a remarkable testimony to it by the fact, that their respective sects, carried away in opposite directions, contradict one another. The sacred books which some reject are exactly those that others prefer. The Ebionites, considering Paul as an apostate from Judaism, rejected his writings, and those of Luke, his fellow-labourer; while, on the contrary, many of the antijudaising Gnostics, Marcion especially, and all the Marcionites, rejected Matthew, Mark, Peter, and John, holding them for apostles of the circumcision. In this manner, far from shaking our confidence in the canon,

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 20.

[2] De Præscript. Hæretic., cap. ii.

these conflicting testimonies, taken as a whole, are equivalent to confirmatory depositions.

(3.) Lastly, it must be, above all, carefully observed, that of all the heretics of the second century, even among the worst, there is not one who disowns the authenticity of the books of the canon, even of the books which they did not receive. The controversy between them and the Church never turned on the apostolicity of the twenty-two *homologoumena*, nor on the credit they had obtained at that time in the universal Church. In rejecting a certain number they only rejected the doctrine, and you never hear them uttering a doubt that these scriptures were not written by the apostles, or the companions of the apostles, whose names they bear. They satisfy themselves with maintaining that the doctrine taught is not conformable to the intentions of Jesus Christ. If Marcion rejected three out of the thirteen epistles bearing the name of Paul, it was not because they were not Paul's, but because Paul wrote them under an evil influence; and if he rejected Matthew and Peter, it was only because Peter and Matthew, he said, "judaised,"—one in his Epistle, the other in his Gospel. But not one of the Marcionites hesitated to acknowledge that, in rejecting them, he set himself in opposition to the judgment of the Church. Let this double acknowledgment be carefully noticed, and let account be taken of this double testimony rendered to the historic authenticity of our holy books. It is of great force; for, with all their hatred against the Church, and with so much knowledge and talent to oppose it, these audacious men, if they could have seen the least possibility of disputing these two facts, would certainly not have neglected to employ so effective a weapon, which, at a stroke, would have levelled their opponents, and ended the controversy for ever.

To give the reader a more correct estimate of this proof, we shall pass rapidly under review the principal heresies of the period, beginning with Marcion, and then going back to the other sects which come nearest to the days of the apostles.[1]

[1] We shall not speak here of the Ophites, nor the Cerinthians, nor the other heretics of the first century who are less known to us, nor of the Arians and Manicheans, who came later, nor even of Theodotus, the tanner of Byzantium, who flourished in the latter half of the second century. We confine ourselves to the first half.

SECTION SECOND.

MARCION.

221. The Marcionite sects were undoubtedly among the most daring in their attempts against the Scriptures; and yet we may see, even in their negations, what an irresistible testimony they render, both to the anterior existence of the first canon, and to the universal authority it then possessed in the churches of God.

Marcion was born in the days of St John, about the end of the first century, at Sinope, on the borders of the Euxine Sea. His father, bishop of that city, having been made acquainted with his being guilty of an act of immorality, was obliged to exclude him from the church, and firmly refused to readmit him. Unable to bear this disgrace, Marcion left Sinope secretly, and repaired to Rome.[1] There, as he was a man of talent and energy, he soon acquired great personal influence, and was welcomed by the Roman clergy. He dared even to aspire to the first place, Epiphanius says, (προεδρίᾳ;) and when rejected by the elders (πρεσβυτέροις) of the church, to whom the cause of his leaving Sinope had been made known, he threw himself in despair into the party of Cerdo. This man was a dangerous Syrian heretic, already notorious in Rome as the head of a powerful antijudaising sect. Marcion gave himself up entirely to his Gnostic views, and in a short time surpassed his master in the boldness of his doctrines, the great number of his disciples, and his attempts against the Scriptures. He methodised his negations with great precision, and impressed his system with the strongly-marked features of his own character. Very soon the attraction of his powerful personality and the seductive boldness of his philosophy gained for him, whether in Italy, Egypt, or Syria, or even in Persia, a large number of disciples; and his sect became so powerful and vigorous, that in the fourth century, if we may believe Epiphanius, it still

[1] Epiph., Haeres., xlii., 1. See also Cave, Dict. Hist. Eccl.; Bingham, Orig. Eccl., i., p. 226; Massuet, De Gnostic. reb., § 135. [Neander disputes the truth of the statement that Marcion was excommunicated for unchastity, &c. See his "General History of the Church," (Torrey's transl.,) vol. ii., p. 136, Bohn's ed.—TR.]

maintained congregations and bishops. Irenæus[1] informs us that this daring man attempted to get himself acknowledged by the bishops of the Church; and having met Polycarp in Rome, he was bold enough to say to him, "Dost thou know me, Polycarp?" "I know thee," replied the martyr, "to be Satan's first-born."

We cannot tell, any more than Tertullian,[2] the exact time when Marcion fixed his residence in Rome. "In what year of the first Antoninus," said that father, "the influence of the dog-star exhaled him from his native Euxine, I have not cared to investigate." But since Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, which was written in 139,[3] speaks of Marcion as still teaching—and at that time his doctrine had been widely disseminated—many years must have elapsed since his separation from the Church. His first arrival in the metropolis of the empire must have preceded, a very long time, the death of Hadrian.

This remark is important. It brings us very near the days of St John; and the simultaneous presence in Rome of Cerdo, Marcion, Tatian, and Valentine with Justin Martyr, is also a fact very worthy of attention. It serves to confirm the testimony to the existence, the use, and the authority of the first canon in the contemporaneous Church, which men so different give at the same time and in the same place.

222. "In separating the law from the gospel, Marcion," Tertullian says, "professed not to be an innovator, and only to restore the apostolic rule, which had been falsified by his opponents, (*non tam innovasse regulam quam retio adulteratam recurasse.*)"[4]

In general, the heretics of the second century, like many rationalists of the nineteenth, from not having comprehended the harmony of the Divine revelations, and those intimate relations which, in the order of grace, connect the respective doctrines of the law and the gospel, could only see in these revelations a remediless antagonism. Entertaining these views, persuaded of their irreconcilableness, they received certain scriptures only, while re-

[1] Haeres., iii., 3.

[2] Adv. Marcion, i., 19:—"Quoto quidem anno Antonini Majoris de Ponte suo exhalaverit aura canicularis, non curavi investigare; de quo tamen constat, Antonianus est hereticus, sub Pio impius."

[3] Apol., c. xxvi.

[4] Adv. Marcion, i., 20.

jecting others, and indulging themselves in a morbid fondness for contrarieties, said they could not make either Peter or James agree with Paul, or Matthew and John with Luke. In the same way some, particularly the Ebionites, as Irenæus states, holding Paul as an apostate from the law, (*apostatam eum legis dicentes,*) rejected him with intense dislike; while Marcion, with many others, straining the doctrines of Paul in an opposite direction, held, on the contrary, that he alone was a true apostle, and admitted into their canon only his epistles, reduced to ten, and the Gospel of Luke. In their aversion to all that was Jewish, they went so far as to maintain that the God of the Jews (the *Demiurgos* or Creator of the visible world) was very different from the God preached by Jesus Christ. Marcion, moreover, like the rationalists of our day, pretended to establish, not only what he called the antitheses, (or contradictions of the two Testaments,) but also the antitheses of Peter and Paul, and of the evangelists, Luke and Mark, or Luke and John. His canon was divided into two parts, Epiphanius tells us,—*the Evangelicon* and *the Apostolicon.* As to his Apostolicon, it consisted only of ten epistles of Paul. Of the thirteen epistles which bear the name of this apostle he excluded the three pastoral epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews, for he kept the Epistle to Philemon. Tertullian[1] has, besides, taken care to inform us that his arrangement of the epistles, without knowing why, was not that which the Church had been accustomed to observe. He also boasted of having restored the true title of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which he called *the Epistle to the Laodiceans,* (Eph. vi. 27.) And the same father assures us that he had made certain alterations in these epistles, particularly in the Epistle to the Romans, "taking away," he said, "what he pleased from the integrity of our instrument,[2] (*auferendo quae voluit de nostri instrumenti integritate.*)" Yet Epiphanius,[3] who passed the same censure upon him, and who indicates seven of these alterations, shews that they

[1] Adv. Marcion, v., 20, 21. See also Epiphanius, Haeres., xlii. The latter puts in Marcion Philemon in the ninth place, and Philippians in the tenth.

[2] Adv. Marcion, v., 13.

[3] Haeres., xlii. Yet it would appear by Origen's commentary on Romans xvi. 25, that he omitted the two last chapters.

were not of much importance, and consisted chiefly in retrenchments. There were, indeed, only three for which there was not some authority.

As to his *Evangelicon*, he has indulged, as we have said, in far greater liberties. He received only one Gospel, which he called *the Gospel of Christ*, and which was called in the Church *the Gospel of Marcion, or the Gospel of the Black Sea*, (the Euxine.) He himself had arranged and modified it; and it was, simply (as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius say unanimously) "*a mutilated*[1] *St Luke.*" The text of this Gospel formed the staple of the composition; but he made alterations and retrenchments, among others, that of the prodigal son, of the Saviour's nativity, and the circumstances of His death on the cross.[2] "These heretics," says Irenæus,[3] "claiming to be more faithful and wise than the apostles, (*sinceriores et prudentiores,*) and alleging that these have announced the gospel still imbued with Judaism, (*adhuc quae sunt Judaeorum sentientes,*) have employed themselves in cutting the Scriptures in pieces, (*ad intercidendas conversi sunt Scripturae,*) ignoring some and mutilating (*decurtantes*) others, as if none were legitimate but such as they had reduced in size, (*minoraverunt.*)"

And it is deserving of notice that Marcion publicly avowed that he had taken away certain passages in the original Scriptures of Christ, (*His opinor conciliis tot originalia instrumenta Christi delere Marcion ausus est.*) "Thou hast thyself avowed it in a certain letter," adds Tertullian;[4] "but by what right hast thou done it? Who art thou? A prophet? then prophesy. An apostle? then preach in public. An apostolic man? then think like the apostles. If a simple Christian, then believe what is given thee. But if thou art neither of all these, then I tell thee with justice, Die!"

All these reproaches which the fathers cast upon him shew with what jealousy the text of our sacred books was then watched.

223. Yet we may remark in passing, while on the subject of these heretics, that it must not be imagined that the mutilations

[1] See Hahn's attempt to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel—Das Evang. Marcions in reiner ursprünglichen Gestalt. Konigsb., 1823.

[2] Epiph., Haeres, xlii. See Kirchhofer's Quellensammlung, p. 336, &c.

[3] Haeres., iii., 12, § 12.

[4] De Carne Christi, cap. ii.

of which Marcion and the Marcionites were guilty were a malpractice frequently repeated. On the contrary, it was a very rare offence, such horror did it excite, and Marcion has remained so notorious in history for this excess of audacity, that Origen,[1] a hundred years after him, when going over his recollections of the Church, could say, "I have known no men who have so mutilated and remodelled (*μεταχαράξαντας*) the gospel as the followers of Marcion and those of Valentine—perhaps also those of Lucan." And yet, as to Valentine, have we not heard Tertullian assure us that this heretic employed *a complete instrument?* so that he did violence to the Scriptures only by perverse glosses, and not by material alterations.

224. Let us stop here to examine more closely the evidence of the testimony which Marcion rendered to the canon in the first quarter of the second century. And for this, imagining ourselves at Rome in the year 128, only twenty-five years after the death of St John, let us stand on the threshold of that pernicious school of philosophy where the young professor from Sinope expounds his *Gnosis*. Or better still, let us go eleven years later, when, in the same city, the martyr Justin, daring to address his first Apology to the emperor, the senate, and all the Roman people, (*καὶ δήμῳ παντὶ Ῥωμαίων,*) he says to them, "How many impious persons are there whom none of you think of persecuting, and in particular one Marcion, from the Euxine Sea,[2] who is even now occupied in teaching his disciples to blaspheme God the Creator, and even to deny Him, pretending that there is one greater than He." Let us go, we say, to the door of that school where the persecutors of the Christians forbear molesting him, and there we shall obtain all the proofs which can be required of us of the existence of the canon. Had the Christian Church, we are asked, already, in the first year of the second century, its sacred collection of scriptures? But who can put this question after having visited Marcion and his school? Who will suppose that the Church has not its collection, when this man, violently separated from it, has already his own? He who in so many things has shewn himself

[1] Contra Celsum, ii., 27.

[2] Apol., i., 26. *Μαρκίωνα δέ τινα Ποντικόν, ὃς* KAÌ NYN "ETI *ἐστι διδάσκων τοῖς πειθομένοις.*

outrageous against the Scriptures; who has maintained doctrines so revolting against God the Creator, against the Old Testament, against the incarnation of Jesus Christ, all the while calling himself a Christian philosopher—this very Marcion has had his well-defined canon, composed of one Gospel and ten epistles, while the Christian Church, which so bitterly reproached him for not receiving the rest, has not its own! And to hear the modern men of learning tell us that the canon published by Marcion is the first of which ecclesiastical literature has left us any memorial! As if the complaints of the fathers, who were indignant at his mutilations, are not the memorials of the complete canon of the contemporaneous Church, as much as they are of the mutilated canon of this heretic!

225. Better to estimate this testimony we must carefully consider the six following remarks:—

(1.) It can be proved, by numerous citations from Tertullian and Irenæus, that Marcion was well acquainted both with the collection of the four Gospels and with the three epistles of Paul, which were excluded from his canon. This has been shewn by Kirchhofer in his *Quellensammlung*, (Collection of the Sources.)

(2.) Marcion never disputed the authority of the nine books of Scripture rejected from his collection. On the contrary, not only was he aware of their existence, but he knew the authority they had in the Church; and, moreover, he never denied that they were rightly attributed to the authors whose names they bore. Only he pretended that they were infected with Judaism, and he set himself to depreciate their authors, Tertullian tells us, in order to gain for his mutilated Gospel the reputation he took from theirs. (*Connititur ad destruendum statum eorum Evangeliorum quae proprie et sub apostolorum*[1] *nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum,*[2] *et scilicet fidem quam illis adimit suo conferat.*) On this account he is for us a very important witness.

(3.) Marcion and the Marcionites avowed[3] that they employed themselves in mutilating the ancient Scriptures, (*tot originalia instrumenta Christi,*) which had been received before their time into the Church. "The Marcionites," Irenæus has already told

[1] It is thus he designates the Gospels of Matthew and John.
[2] He here refers to Mark. [3] Iren., Haeres., iii., 12.

us, "pretending to be more sincere and more wise than the apostles, have applied themselves to cutting into the Scriptures, rejecting some and mutilating others." That is the reason why we have heard Tertullian opposing the canon of Marcion to the canon of the Church, (*auferendo quae voluit de nostri instrumenti integritate.*) [1]

(4.) We hear all his opponents (Tertullian, Irenæus, Origen, Epiphanius) charge him, not with introducing unknown texts, but with having altered those which were in circulation before him.

(5.) Among the charges they make against him is one which, without being very grave, is important, as shewing us the extent to which the collection of the Scriptures had been studied in all the churches, and what place it had taken as an organic whole in the usages of the people of God. We have seen that Marcion, while retaining ten [2] of the thirteen epistles which the Church had attributed without exception to St Paul, had thought well to alter their order, and how he is blamed for this change by Tertullian in his fifth book against Marcion, and by Epiphanius in his forty-second chapter against heresies. How remarkable it is that, only twenty-five years after the death of the disciple whom Jesus loved, this collection should have become so familiar to all the churches of God, that they were already in the habit of arranging Paul's thirteen epistles and the four Gospels in one invariable order,[3] though an order which, as we have repeatedly said, is by no means that of their composition! How certainly must this arrangement of the sacred books have prevailed always and everywhere, for Epiphanius in his charges against Marcion to have supposed that it dated from the days of the apostles. "Marcion," he says, "puts the Epistle to the Philippians in the second place, while, according to the apostle, it is in the sixth, (*παρὰ δὲ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἕκτῃ.*) He puts Philemon in the ninth, while, accord-

[1] Adv. Marc., v., 13.

[2] We only speak here of the first canon. We shall treat in the sequel of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[3] In the ancient Latin manuscript at Cambridge, (Bezæ,) the four Gospels are arranged thus—Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark. It appears that before Jerome's time this was the ancient order. It is the only one of the manuscripts of a high antiquity (says M. Berga de Xurey) which joins the Greek to the Latin translation.

ing to the apostle, it is the last, (*παρὰ δέ τῳ αποστόλῳ ἐσχάτη κεῖται ;*) the first to the Thessalonians in the seventh, while the apostle puts it in the eighth; and as to the Epistle to the Romans, he has put it (he says) in the fourth place, that, as far as he is concerned, nothing may remain in its place, that nothing might be right with him, (*ἵνα μηδὲν ὀρθὸν παρ' αὐτῷ εἴη.*)" [1]

Certainly this unanimity of the churches in arranging our sacred books everywhere in the same order, and different from their respective dates, is in days so remote a very significant fact to shew us the place already taken by the canon in the usages of the universal Church.

(6.) Lastly, the indignation of all the fathers on the subject of Marcion's attempts against the Scriptures, and the precise charges which they brought against him, attest with what holy jealousy the text of our Scriptures was then guarded in the churches of God.

But the testimony of Tatian will come to complete that of Marcion.

Section Third.

TATIAN.

226. Cave and other ecclesiastical historians often complain of the uncertainty that prevails in the chronology of all the heretics of the second century. Thus, as to Tatian, while Epiphanius puts in the second year of Antoninus Pius (that is to say, in 149) the end of the long sojourn which this heretic made in Rome, whither he went to found a school of heresy, others would place these facts twenty years later.[2] As to ourselves, who are going back through the years of the second century, we think it convenient, without wishing to decide the question, to place Tatian immediately after Marcion, because history throws important light on that of the teacher of Sinope.

He was, like Marcion, a clever, learned man, but haughty and impetuous, and, like him, resided for a time in Rome; and again, like him, after having appeared to unite himself to the Church of God, violently broke off from it, and set himself against one part of its canon, but yet not against the same books. It is as such,

[1] Haeres., xlii., p. 368. [2] Cave, Scripta Eccles. Hist. Litt., vol. i., p. 75.

also, that Tatian renders our Scriptures a testimony which serves to complete that of Marcion and that of Justin Martyr. Born in Assyria, of a pagan family, he at first devoted himself with great ardour to the study of the philosophy of his time, when he repaired to Rome, and there met Justin, "that admirable man, (*ὁ θαυμασιώτατος Ἰουστῖνος,*)" as he calls him.[1] From that moment he made a profession of Christianity, and attached himself so closely to Justin, that after his martyrdom he aimed to continue his school. But very soon his success inflated him, and became his ruin, Irenæus said. He devoted his attention to the systems of error borrowed from the philosophies of the East, and on returning to Mesopotamia, he became the chief of the Encratites, ascetics who united the foolish fancies of Valentine with the repulsive theories of Marcion.

We have said that, with regard to the canon, Tatian completes at the same time the testimony of Justin and that of Marcion: of Justin, since he cites without hesitation the writings of Paul and those of John, while the works of the martyr which have come down to us say little of them; and of Marcion, since he attributes directly to Paul the Epistle to Titus, while Marcion, as we know, rejected it.

Besides this, in his *Address to the Greeks*, Tatian makes evident allusions to the Gospel of John and to his Apocalypse. Moreover, we learn from Irenæus,[2] and also from Jerome,[3] that to defend his heresies, he called in the authority of the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians and to the Galatians.

But still further, we have to cite from this mischievous man a literary fact very significant for the authority of the canon, and more especially of the sacred collection of the four evangelists. It is, that among the great multitude of his works, (*infinita volumina*, says Jerome,) the authors of that time often name "the important harmony of the four Gospels,"[4] which he himself called, *The Composition of the Four*, (*τὸ Διὰ Τεσσάρων.*) "It was," says Eusebius,[5] "a collection and a certain combination of the Gospels,

[1] In his Address to the Greeks, pp. 18, 19.

[2] Hæres., i. 28. See also Eusebius, H. E., iv., 29; Tatian, Orat. ad Græc, cap. xlii., 135, 18, 19.

[3] De Scriptor., cap. xxix.

[4] Epiphanius says expressly the four Gospels.

[5] H. E., iv., 29.

(*συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγήν . . . τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθείς.*)"

See, then, already, so near the death of St John, the collection of the four evangelists acknowledged, thoughtfully read, and compared by the labours even of a dangerous heretic, who denied, with so many other truths of our faith, the humanity of our Lord, and the reality of His death. No doubt Tatian made some culpable retrenchments in this collection; but these alterations do not appear on the first reading, and neither Eusebius nor Theodoret (who speak of it) intimate that he introduced any fragment of an apocryphal Gospel. His work, even in the days of Eusebius, was still "used by certain persons who were not aware of the alterations, (*καὶ παρά τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται.*)" Epiphanius expressly tells us that it was *composed of the four Gospels*, and that many called it *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*. Lastly, Theodoret,[1] almost a century after Epiphanius, while informing us that Tatian had left out the genealogy of the Saviour, and the passages that point out His descent from David according to the flesh, tells us that his book was still in circulation in some places. "I have myself found," he says, "more than two hundred copies in our churches, (of Syria,) which have received them with respect. I made use of them, without understanding the fraud, (*κακουργίαν*;) but, having collected them all, I took them away, to replace them by the Gospels of the four evangelists."

This testimony of Tatian is of great value; but go back still higher in the century to arrive at Valentine and the six different sects which bear his name.

Section Fourth.

VALENTINE AND THE VALENTINIANS.

227. The Valentinians, as it would appear from all the fathers who have described them, were one of the most powerful and most pernicious of the Gnostic sects. Valentine, born in Egypt, began his public career as a teacher of the Platonic philosophy, but, like many other teachers of the same period, he established himself in Rome as the seat of his labours many years before

[1] Haeres., i., 20.

Justin Martyr, on the one hand, or Marcion and Tatian on the other, had commenced theirs. Valentine preceded these two men, celebrated on such different grounds, and his testimony must be placed very much nearer the days of the apostles, for he had made himself known in 120. He said himself that he was a disciple of a friend of St Paul, and Irenæus tells us[1] that he came to Rome during the episcopate of Hyginus, and that he lived there to the time of Anicetus. He was, therefore, in the metropolis when Polycarp came on a mission from the Eastern Churches, and might have had Marcion among his hearers. His lectures attracted a crowd. A great number of admirers were attached to him, both from the superiority of his abilities and the power of his eloquence, (*quia et ingenio poterat et eloquio.*) "He had even aspired to the episcopate," says Tertullian,[2] "and it was thought that, in the chagrin of his disappointed ambition, he broke off his connexion with the true Church, (*de Ecclesiâ authenticae regulae abrupit.*)" Yet his impieties did not exhibit themselves in all their audacity till after his retirement to the island of Cyprus. His principal disciples, Ptolemy, Secundus, Heracleon, Mark, and others, formed as many distinct sects, gained a conspicuous position in their age, and were in general better known than Valentine himself. Irenæus begins his great work on *Heresies* with an exposition of the strange Valentinian systems. Tertullian combats them in like manner in his book, *De Praescriptione Hereticorum*, Clement in his *Stromata*, and, later still, Origen, Hippolytus, and others.

228. But here, as to the first canon, it is a fact of the greatest value that already, in these remote days, Valentine and his disciples, in spite of their most audacious heresies and violent hatred against the Churches of God, openly acknowledged the entire collection of the Scriptures at that time received. Valentine made war upon them only by the Oriental fancies of his imagination, and by the boldness with which he dared to found the most pernicious systems of error on his strange interpretations. Neither he nor his followers directly rejected any of the Scriptures. He had the same canon of the New Testament as the contemporary Church. "Valentine," said Tertullian, "appears to make use of a complete collection, (*Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur;*)"

[1] Haeres., iii., 4, 3. [2] Contra Valent., cap. iv.

but, added he, "by the violence he does to the meaning of words, this man has taken away from the Scriptures, and added more to them, than was done openly and with a loud voice by Marcion himself, sword in hand, (*exertè et palam machaerâ,*) the one perverting by his interpretations where the other mutilated the texts." The fragments of his writings that have been preserved by the fathers shewed that he made use of the Scriptures like the Christians of his age. When he cites the Epistle to the Ephesians, it is by calling it *the scripture*, and, in the same fragment, he clearly appeals to the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, to the Epistle to the Romans, to the Epistle to the Corinthians,[1] and also, though less clearly, to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and to the first of John. When Irenæus[2] reproaches the Valentinians for having dared to entitle a certain book composed by them, "*The Gospel of Truth*," he says, "he had had it only a little time," and in complete disagreement with the Gospels of the apostles. It was only a Gnostic commentary recently published to explain their errors, without their having ceased on this account to acknowledge with the universal Church the four canonical Gospels.

We shall not embarrass ourselves here with their absurd doctrines; we are occupied only by their historical testimony, and this testimony strikes us as so much the more significant since they abandoned themselves to the most extravagant fancies about their *pleroma*, their *thirty aeons*, their *ten decades*, and their *female aeon* or the *mother Achamoth*. We may see the strange fancies of this Christianised paganism seriously exposed and refuted in the great work of Irenæus, and also in other fathers. In that work we hear them citing themselves almost every book of the canon to defend their errors, and thus, without any apologetic intention, they attest the authority our Scriptures possessed throughout the contemporary Church. If we confine ourselves to example—to the fragments cited by Irenæus—we shall see the four Gospels adduced, (though with a manifest preference for that of John,) and a frequent use made of Paul's epistles, especially of the Epistles

[1] De Praescript. Haeret., cap. xxxviii. Tertullian opposes the ancient instrument to the new. This term, *instrumentum*, Quintilian applies to the writings of a lawsuit; and in Suetonius, *instrumentum imperii* is an inventory or description of the empire.

[2] Adv. Haeres., iii., 11, 9.

to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. "By means of a fallacious exegesis, (*ῥαδιουργοῦντες τας ἐξηγήσεις,*)" says that father, "they take their demonstrations (*ἀποδείξεις*) from the *evangelical* Scriptures, and the *apostolic* epistles, (*ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ αποστολικῶν.*)"[1]

But more than this, and with all our desire to compress, we must have, among other Valentinians, the two chiefs of their two most noted sects, Heracleon and Ptolemy, both of the Western school.

Section Fifth.

HERACLEON AND PTOLEMY.

230. These two heretical teachers must be regarded as anterior to Valentine, though they have been generally classed among the Valentinians, on account of the similiarity of their errors.

Heracleon is represented by Clement of Alexandria[2] as the most distinguished (*δοκιμώτατος*) teacher of the Valentinian school; but what must render him more noticeable for us is, that he is the most ancient commentator on the New Testament in the West whose name has come down to us.

We may judge of the antiquity to which these *commentaries* of Heracleon lead us back, when we state that he had made himself notorious in Sicily by his heresies when Bishop Alexander occupied the see of Rome, (from 109 to 116,) that is to say, six years, or not more than thirteen years after the death of John; for it was at the express request of the bishops of Sicily, assembled in council, that this bishop composed a work *against Heracleon*, abounding in declarations from the Holy Scriptures.[3] The writings, therefore, of this heretic must have been already published, at the latest, only eight or ten years after St John's death, and perhaps much earlier.

We cannot tell exactly in the present day what books of the New Testament Heracleon expounded. But we learn from Origen that he explained all the Gospel according to John;[4] and from

[1] Haer., lib. i., cap. iii.

[2] Strom., i., iv., 9.

[3] Cave, Hist. Litt., p. 47. Bâle, 1741.

[4] This father cites him at length more than forty times in his own commentary on John. The fragments of Heracleon on this Gospel have been collected by Grabe, "Spicilegium," ii., 85–117.

Clement of Alexandria that he had also commented on that of Luke.[1] We have, besides, large fragments of him cited by the fathers, and learn from them that he quoted Matthew, as well as many epistles of Paul, with this formula, "*the apostle says*," particularly the Epistle to the Romans, the Epistle to the Corinthians, and the second to Timothy.

231. The reader should take special notice here of a fact which is of great importance at this epoch—the appearance of commentaries on the New Testament, both in the West and East, (as we shall soon shew.) What must the writings of the New Testament have already become in the Church, for even heretics to experience the need of such works? But more than this, we can see in the very character of the commentary of Heracleon what was then the belief formed in the churches touching the full inspiration of our sacred books, even to details in their language, since we see the author, particularly on the subject of the Pastoral Epistles, regard as significant even the slightest variations[2] in the words of the apostle. Certainly nothing can better attest the contemporary faith in the authenticity and authority of our Scriptures than the spectacle of these unhappy men obliged, in order to obtain some credit, to cite them and to pervert them as the books on which the faith of all the churches of God rested. Would they have acted thus if the authority of these books had not been for a long time fully established?

And as to Ptolemy, whom the fathers equally place among the Gnostics of the Italian school, to distinguish them from the Oriental Gnostics, Tertullian[3] places him before Heracleon.[4] Irenæus, who undertook to refute him, represents him as knowing how to give the most seductive appearance to the Gnostic errors; and Epiphanius makes him known to us more fully by reciting a letter which he had written to one of his disciples, a female, named Flora. In that you will hear him cite in favour of his heresies the Gospel of Matthew, the prologue of that of St John, passages from Paul's Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Ephesians; as you will also find in the fragments preserved by

[1] Strom., iv., 9.
[2] See him on 2 Tim. ii. 23; Clement, Strom., iv., l. c.
[3] Adv. Valentine, iv.
[4] Hares., xxxiv.

Irenæus,[1] passages taken from the four Gospels, and the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Colossians.

But we shall be able to remount still higher, I mean to Basilides and his son Isidore, to Carpocrates and to the Ebionites.

SECTION SIXTH.

BASILIDES AND HIS SON ISIDORE.

232. In our upward course through the crowd of heretics of the second century, it is often difficult, as we have said, to disentangle their respective ages. Yet it appears sufficiently clear that Basilides was much more ancient than Cerdo and Heracleon. He was the leader of a Gnostic sect of the Oriental school, and his son, who was equally celebrated after him, made a great number of disciples.

Basilides had already rendered himself famous in Egypt,[2] about the year 112, and it is said that he died about the end of Hadrian's reign. He professed to have had for his master a companion of St Peter, (Glaukias, his interpreter.) A disciple of Menander, who was himself a disciple of Simon the Magician, Basilides was among the first Gnostics, like one of those *enfants perdus* who are set in the forefront of the battle. He betook himself from Syria to Persia, where he spread the errors on the origin of evil that were at a later period propagated by Manes, and after that he returned to found a school in Egypt. He endeavoured to recommend his pernicious doctrines by an eloquence inflated with all the pomp of language. According to him, Christ did not assume our flesh, and suffered only in appearance. He reckoned 365 heavens, of which he recited the birth, placing above all abraxas a mystic power, the name of which in Greek letters forms the number 365, and which he made use of for magical purposes.

Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius,[3] and Epiphanius, who all speak of this pernicious man, have preserved fragments of his

[1] Adv. Hæres., i., 1, 8, vi., 35.
[2] See Cave, Hist. Litt., p. 49; Clement, Stromata, i., 7.
[3] Hist. Eccles., iv., 7.

writings; and Eusebius tells us that Agrippa Castor, a very able and celebrated writer of that epoch, powerfully refuted them.

234. All these testimonies shew us that Basilides was in the East what Heracleon had been in the West—the most ancient of the known commentators on the New Testament; for he had also, Eusebius tells, "composed twenty-four books of *commentaries* (ἐξηγητικῶν) on the gospel." Here we see the gospel commented upon publicly in the East, very near the time of St John, as it was in the West! Besides this, Clement of Alexandria[1] tells us, that his followers supported their doctrines relative to marriage on Matt. xix. 11, 12, and 1 Cor. viii. 9; and another of their errors on what Paul said to the Romans, vii. 7, "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Basilides, also, Clement affirms,[2] cited in the twenty-third of his Exegetics a beautiful passage from the 1st Epistle of Peter, (iv. 14–16;) and we find Origen[3] censures him for wishing to found his dogma of metempsychosis (μετενσωματωσεως) on those words of St Paul to the Romans, "For I was alive without the law once," (vii. 9,) that is to say, before being in this human body.

235. We might proceed still further with this review of the primitive heretics, and go back to Cerinthus, or Menander, or Simon the Magician, to listen to new testimonies. We might cite Carpocrates and his son Epiphanes, more ancient than Basilides, and who, while practising magic, and holding the doctrine of metempsychosis, did not hesitate to vindicate their moral irregularities by quotations from Luke, (xii. 52,) from Matthew, (v. 25,) from the Epistles of Paul to Timothy, (1 vi. 20, 2 i. 14,) and from the First Epistle of John, (v. 19.)[4] Above all, we might appeal to the most ancient sect, the Ebionites, who began in the lifetime of the apostles, and were violent Judaizers, denying the Divinity of Christ, and setting themselves against Paul and Luke. Nevertheless, they raised no objection to the authority of the epistles of this apostle, nor of the acts of Luke, nor of the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John, though they made, by means of a mutilated

[1] Stromata, iii. [2] IV. Opp., p. 504. Paris, 1629.

[3] In Ep. ad Roman, cap. v. Opp., tom. iv., p. 549, edit. Bened.

[4] See Iren., Haeres., i., 25; Tertull., De Praescript., cap. xxv.; Orig. in Genes., ch. i.; Kirchhofer, Quellensamml., pp. 419, 420.

Matthew, a Gospel which was called *The Gospel of the Ebionites.*[1] But we have said enough, and we hasten to come at last to *the apostolic fathers,* so called because they had seen with their own eyes the apostles of the Lord.

[1] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 27. The reader who wishes to pursue the study of these witnesses further, may consult Bunsen's Hippolytus, Kirchhofer's Quellensammlung, and the recent work of Mr Westcott on the Canon, pp. 301–305, Cambridge, 1855.

CHAPTER X.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

SECTION FIRST.

THEIR SMALL NUMBER AND THEIR VALUE.

236. IT was in the time of these fathers that the Church, deprived of its living prophets, was obliged henceforward to advance towards the kingdom of heaven by the sole light of the written Word. Their testimony, such as it is, is fitted to give us the utmost satisfaction; but we must not forget their small number.

Although the name of *apostolic father* might belong to men who, like Ignatius and Polycarp, while having known personally some one of the apostles, prolonged their old age even to the middle of the second century, they are, as we have said, extremely few; and, besides, their authentic writings do not form all together more than a very small volume, composed of epistles only, and these of no great length. We can reckon only eight, or, according to others, twelve. The following is their order, beginning with the most ancient. One by Clement, the second bishop of Rome, to the church at Corinth; one by Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, to the church of the Philippians; one of the same church of Smyrna, narrating the martyrdom of Polycarp; three of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, to Polycarp, to the church at Ephesus, and to that at Rome;[1] one on the martyrdom of Ignatius; and, lastly, one to

[1] We have said that some persons reckon the writings of the apostolic fathers to amount to twelve, instead of eight, because they include four epistles of Ignatius, which are now strongly suspected to be spurious. (See Prop. 253, &c.)

Diognetus, but of which we know neither the author nor the date, though its authenticity is universally admitted.[1]

We do not add *The Shepherd of Hermas*, because its date, now known by the fragment of Muratori,[2] is too late to give it a place among the apostolic fathers. Still less shall we add some other works, which almost all the learned men of the present day place in the rank of supposititious books—the Second Epistle, attributed to Clement, his pretended Homilies, and the pretended Epistle of Barnabas.[3]

237. Modern rationalism has made great efforts to weaken the testimony of these fathers.

The first objection is founded on the numerical superiority of these citations of the Old Testament to those they have made from the New; whence it may be inferred, it is said, that our canon was either indifferent or unknown to them. But this fact alleged

[1] At least to the 11th chapter. (Hefele, Patrum Apostol. Opera. Tubing., 1847. Proleg.)

[2] This fragment states that Hermas was a brother of Pius I., bishop of Rome. (See Prop. 192.)

[3] The following reasons for rejecting the Epistle of Barnabas are given more at large in Hefele, (Patrum Apostol., proleg., p. 14):—1. We have a part of this epistle only in a Latin version. [The whole of the original Greek has been recently discovered by Tischendorf. See the prolegomena to his *third* edition of the Septuagint, (Lips., 1860,) p. 96.—Tr.] 2. The true Barnabas must have died between 60 and 62; but it may be seen, from the sixteenth chapter of this epistle, that it was composed after the destruction of Jerusalem. 3. If this epistle had been held to be authentic by the primitive Christians, it would have been inserted in the canon, because Barnabas was a prophet, (Acts xiii. 1.) 4. It contains many extravagant and erroneous expressions which it is impossible to attribute to the true Barnabas, (the apostles, for example, he calls *ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομώτεροι.*) 5. The tenth chapter contains ridiculous opinions and indelicate details which cannot be ascribed to this apostolic man. 6. The true Barnabas, who had often travelled through Asia Minor and sojourned in Syria, knew perfectly well that what is said in chap. ix. of the circumcision of all the priests of the idols, and of all the Syrians, is false. 7. The puerile allegories which fill the fifth chapter and the six following come from a man very different from him whose eloquence made him be called by the apostles בַּר נְבוּאָה. 8. It is impossible that the true Barnabas, who was a Levite, and had lived at Jerusalem, could utter on the Jewish rites the falsehoods in chaps. vii. and viii. 9. This piece betrays an antijudaism, contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, on circumcision, (chap. ix.;) on the Sabbath, (chap. xv.;) on the economy of the Old Testament, which he asserts ceased not at the promulgation of the gospel, but when Moses broke the tables of the law, (chaps. iv. and xiv.) All this savours of the Gnosticism of the second century, and its foolish wisdom.

by the rationalists does not exist. If you except Clement of Rome, who wrote very near the time of Paul's martyrdom, and, consequently, was disposed (as the apostles had been) to quote the Old Testament very frequently rather than refer to contemporaneous writings, you will find that the apostolic fathers have made, on the contrary, very frequent use of the New Testament. Indeed, so little ground is there for this objection, that we shall more be struck by the contrary excess. In *Polycarp*, for example, you will find almost fifty quotations from the New Testament for one from Moses and the prophets; while, in *the Epistle to Diognetus*, you will be even struck with the studious care with which the author seems to avoid the Old Testament.[1]

238. A second objection of the rationalists is the want of precision in the passages where the fathers seem to adduce the New Testament. They do not quote them, it is said, either directly or correctly, and when it happens that they give a sentence exactly, it is almost always without naming the author; this must bring us to the conviction that these fathers had not the same books in their hands as ourselves. But this second objection is of no more value than the first; for the examples we shall cite go to shew that almost always, on the contrary, the language of these fathers is manifestly that of authors quite full of our Scriptures, and whose readers are intimately acquainted with the sacred Word. The apostolic fathers pour forth and spread abroad the sayings of our holy books in their own language; they take them freely, and from memory, without restricting themselves to the same terms; they often blend several passages in the same sentence, so as to make a continuous discourse; they paraphrase them when they quote them to adapt them better to their own thoughts; and you see they are satisfied that their readers will understand them at half a word, and recognise immediately the source from which they have drawn their materials. Is it not just so that in our own day men most intimately acquainted with the Scriptures speak, when they address other men who are nourished by the same spiritual food? Let us open their letters, written under circumstances such as those of the apostolic fathers, and we shall

[1] See Semisch, Justin der Martyrer; Breslau, 1840; vol. i., p. 180. Hefele, Patr. Apost., proleg., p. 77.

be struck with the resemblance. We shall even recognise, in reference to their preoccupation with the Scriptures, a superiority in the latter; for it must not be forgotten that the only writings which have come down to us of these men of God are pastoral epistles, composed, not to inculcate doctrines, but to exhort, to console, to recount the examples of martyrs, and to encourage their brethren.

239. Such, to give an example from later times, were the letters of the great Calvin, a man so eminently distinguished by his reverence for the Scriptures. Take his two hundred and seventy-two letters in French, and compare them. This interesting collection, recently edited by Jules Bonnet, has struck us vividly by its resemblance to the epistles of the apostolic fathers, as to the manner of quoting the New Testament. While writing these lines we have the first volume before us; and, though admiring it, we very soon discover that the Reformer himself referred much less frequently to the New Testament in his letters than these fathers did in theirs. We do not hesitate to affirm that, if we were disposed to reason about this great theologian in the same style as the German rationalists have adopted towards Polycarp, Ignatius, and Clement, we might legitimately deduce from his letters the same conclusions against the existence of a canon in the sixteenth century which they have drawn from our eight epistles against the existence of a canon in the second. In the Latin text of Hefele these eight epistles occupy eighty-seven pages in octavo;[1] while the two volumes of Calvin contain upwards of a thousand. But suppose nothing was left to us of the Reformer but his French letters, certainly future critics, in taking the first eighty-seven pages, or the second, or as far as the tenth, would have much stronger grounds for expressing doubts on the canon of Calvin than modern critics have for those they have expressed on the canon of the fathers. Could Calvin, they might ask, make use of the same Gospels or the same epistles as ourselves? And in these Gospels, or these epistles, can a text truly like our own be found? In fact, in his French letters, which are

[1] That of Clement at most thirty-five pages, (deducting the notes;) the three of Ignatius eighteen, that of his martyrdom five; that of Polycarp seven, that of his martyrdom eleven; and that to Diognetus eleven.

hortatory and pastoral, (like those of Polycarp, Clement, or Ignatius,) he does not quote the New Testament more than they do, or, rather, he quotes it much less. No doubt, the spirit of his correspondence is wholly impregnated with it; but he does not quote it textually, and, like the fathers, does it almost always from memory; he paraphrases it more or less; he adapts the terms to his purpose to retain only the most striking point; he rarely names the author, and indicates him rather in vague terms, just as do the fathers. Take, for example, his touching letter to Mme. de Cany on the eminently Christian death of Mme. de Normandie, (vol. i., p. 295,) an epistle almost as long as that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and compare it with that. It contains only a single phrase from the New Testament, and with a very slight reference,—"St Paul, treating of charity, does not forget that *we ought to weep with those that weep.*" Again, take his four admirable letters to the students of Lausanne, the martyrs at Lyons, and that to the martyr Dimonet. In the last, (p. 367,) he quotes only two short sentences, without marking either the place or the author. In the first, to the martyrs at Lyons, having been consulted on points of doctrine, (vows, celibacy, monastic poverty, and the nature of the glorified body,) he adduces expressly one passage from Matthew, two from Paul, and one from the Apocalypse; but in the second, (p. 371,) he cites none of them, excepting that he says, in vague terms, "Let me remind you of that saying, that *stronger is he that is in you than he that is in the world.*" In the third, (p. 382,) there is not a single quotation, though the whole letter, throughout its five pages, is imbued with unction from on high. In the fourth, there is one short expression—"*I know in whom I have believed;*" and yet how does he introduce it? Without naming either Paul or his epistle, and then by paraphrasing it:—"You can say with that valiant champion of Jesus Christ, 'I know from whom I received my faith.'" Reason, then, about Calvin in the style of the German rationalists, when they speak of Clement or Ignatius. "What!" (you might very well say,) "in this long letter, written by the greatest Reformer of the sixteenth century to young martyrs immured in a dungeon, there is not another citation from the whole New Testament! Calvin, then, could not have had our canon! And even there is

nothing to attest that in this short phrase he intended to cite the Second Epistle to Timothy, or, at least, if he did so intend, that he had before him the same Greek text as our own, since we do not find in it the exact translation of Paul's words!" But enough of this.

We know very well that this mode of citation, very far from indicating a time when the canon did not exist, marks, on the contrary, a time when the Scriptures were everywhere spread abroad, read in all public assemblies, familiar to all, small and great, in the memory of all, and so recognised by half a word. Why, then, not reason on the epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, as any one would do on those of Calvin?

Perhaps some apology should be made for having given too much space to objections which will have their day, and will soon be forgotten. We now come to these eight letters, and we will begin with the latest.

Section Second.

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

240. The name of the apostolic person to whom we owe this eloquent production remains unknown to us; and all we know of Diognetus is that he was a pagan of distinction. The majority of learned men have for a long time[1] attributed this epistle to Justin Martyr. But, besides that the too late age of this father does not correspond with what this author says of his own,[2] the manifest superiority of his style does not allow us to think of Justin; while his doctrines, antijudaical to excess, allow it still less. Others, on the contrary, ascribe it to Clement of Rome; and others to Apollos.[3] It is, without doubt, more ancient than Justin; but it is also more recent than those two men of God; and we rather think with Hefele, that the allusions in the seventh chapter to great contemporary persecutions, and the rapid increase of the

[1] Cave, Teutzel, Fabricius, &c.

[2] Chap. xi., of his having been a hearer of the apostles.

[3] Lumper, De Vita Patrum, tom. i., p. 159. (See Mohler, Patrologie, p. 159; and Gallandi. See Hefele, 79.)

Church, assign its place at the end of Trajan's reign, (117,) or towards the beginning of Hadrian's, (133.)

But if we examine this remarkable piece, we shall soon recognise in the author a zealous disciple of Jesus. He addresses himself, it is true, to a man who is still a stranger to the New Testament; but we perceive that he himself is thoroughly imbued with it, and that he was living in the midst of a people who were nourished like himself by that heavenly manna.

241. In the fourth page, where he recalls to Diognetus the superstitious practices of the Jews, devoted to the observance (*παρατήρησιν*) of months, and days, and times, (*καιρῶν,*) you see him borrow the language of Paul, (Gal. iv. 10.) In his fifth chapter, in which he describes the life of Christians, you still find paraphrased expressions from the epistles of the apostle to the Corinthians and Philippians.[1] "They are in the flesh," he says, "but do not live according to the flesh; they pass their time on earth, but they are citizens of heaven; they love all men, and are persecuted by all; they are not known, and are condemned; they are put to death, and made alive; they are esteemed beggars, and enrich many; they are destitute of all things, and yet abound in all things; they are treated with insult, and glorified in their insults; they are blasphemed, and are justified; they are reproached, and they bless," &c.

In his eleventh chapter, in which he is speaking of communion with Christ, and of His benefits for docile souls who keep within "the limits traced by faith, and indicated by the fathers," he adds; "Then the fear of the *law* is celebrated, and the grace of the *prophets* is known, the faith of the *Gospels* is established, the teaching (*παράδοσις*) of the *apostles* is guarded, and the grace of the Church leaps (*σκιρτᾷ*) with joy."

In his ninth chapter, in which he explains the mission of the Son of God, "His goodness, (*χρηστότητα,*)[2] His power, and His superabounding love towards men, (*ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας,*)" he says, "He himself took upon Him our sins, He gave up His own Son as a ransom in our stead, (*λύτρον ὑπερ ἡμῶν,*) the

[1] 2 Cor. vi. 8–10; and also Phil. iii. 18–20; 1 Cor. iv. 12. A comparison with the Greek will shew most clearly these references of his letter to the epistles.

[2] Rom. ii. 4, xi. 32; Titus iii. 4.

holy for the lawless, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for mortals. By what could our sins be covered but by His righteousness? By whom was it possible that we, the lawless and the impious, could be justified, except ing by the only Son of God? Oh, sweet exchange! Oh, inscrutable operation! Oh, unexpected benefits! (*Ὦ τῆς γλυκείας ἀπαλλαγῆς, ὦ τῆς ἀνεξιχνιάστου δημιουργίας, ὦ τῶν απροσδοκήτων εὐεργεσιῶν,*) that the iniquity of many should be hidden in one Just One, and that, by the righteousness of one, (*δικαιοσύνῃ δὲ ἑνὸς,*) He should justify many of the lawless, (*πολλοὺς ἀνόμους δικαίωσῃ*!)"[1]

And again, in the twelfth chapter, having shewn that, in the soul of the believer, as in the paradise of God, "the tree of knowledge must never be separated from the tree of life," he says, "Life cannot be secure without knowledge, or knowledge without life; wherefore each is planted near the other."

He then adds these remarkable words, in which he appeals to the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, as a modern Christian pastor might do in the midst of our flocks:—"Observing the power of this union, the apostle, blaming the knowledge (*τὴν γνῶσιν*) which is exercised without the truth of the commandment for life, says, *Knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up;*" the author employing without any change St Paul's own words, *ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δε ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ,* (1 Cor. viii. 1.)

Here, then, at the beginning of the second century, the Epistle to Diognetus directly quotes the apostle Paul and his Epistle to the Corinthians! The author had at that time the sacred collection before him, or carried it reverently in his memory, and, moreover, he wrote in the midst of a Christian people, among whom our Scriptures were universally known; for he does not even give himself the trouble to specify the name of him whom he calls *the apostle,* nor the title of his epistle. But why should he take this trouble? Would not these four words be sufficient for every one then, as at the present day, to be able to recognise the epistle, and lay his finger on the passage?

We now go back to Polycarp, and begin with his martyrdom.

[1] See Romans v. 12–21

SECTION THIRD.

THE CIRCULAR (ἐγκύκλιος) EPISTLE OF THE CHURCH OF SMYRNA.

242. This is certainly one of the most interesting monuments of ecclesiastical antiquity, as it is one of the most authentic. We find it inserted almost entire in the history of Eusebius.[1] It was at the request of a church in Phrygia that the church of Smyrna wrote this circular letter to all the parishes of the universal Church. It will be found to be imbued entirely with the spirit of the Scriptures. Scaliger, in his notes on Eusebius, declares that he had never seen anything in the history of the Church which more deeply affected him. "I seemed to be another man," he said, "after reading it."

Let us now listen to the first chapter:—

"Almost all things that went before happened," it says, "that the Lord might shew us from above a testimony (or martyrdom) according to the Gospel, (*τὸ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μαρτύριον.*) . . . For who would not admire the generosity, and endurance, and love towards the Lord of these witnesses? . . . Staying themselves on the grace of Christ, they despised earthly tortures. They had before their eyes the escaping from the fire that is eternal, and never to be quenched, and they looked with the eyes of the heart on the goods that are reserved for those who persevere, *which ear hath not heard, nor eye seen, nor has it entered into the heart of man,*" (chap. ii.)

We find ourselves here in this first page not only on the height of apostolic faith, but with that faith expressed in the very words of Paul to the Corinthians, (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

And, a few lines lower, (chap. iv.,) giving an account of the sad fall of a Phrygian named Quintus who offered himself to persecution, and lost courage at the sight of the lions brought out for his punishment, the epistle makes this reflection—"Therefore, brethren, we do not praise those who offer themselves voluntarily,

[1] Book iv., chap. xv. The Acts of this martyr are the most ancient that exist; but as to the precise time when the event took place, the learned are not agreed. Cave and Lardner place it in 147; Gieseler and Neander in 167.

for this is not what the *Gospel*[1] teaches, (*ἐπειδὴ οὐχ' οὕτως διδάσκει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.*)"

The narrative presents other quotations from the Sacred Word which for brevity we do not mention; but when the venerable bishop, eighty-five years old, appeared before the proconsul, who commanded him to swear by the fortune of Cæsar, we hear immediately appeal to our Scriptures, (Rom. xiii. 1; Titus iii. 1,)—"It is my duty to answer you, for we have been taught to render, as it becomes us, the honour to principalities and powers ordained by God—(*δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ πρόσηκον τὴν μὴ βλάπτουσαν ἡμᾶς ἀπονέμειν,*)—the honour, at least," he added, "that hurts us not," (that is, before God.)

But above all, his last prayer, in the fourteenth chapter, ought to be read. We pass on to his own letter.

Section Fourth.

THE EPISTLE OF POLYCARP.

243. This admirable monument is at once of an antiquity approaching so near the apostles, of an authenticity so perfectly attested, and so abundantly rich in its quotations of Scripture, that itself alone would furnish satisfactory evidence of the universal use of the canon in the first years of the second century.

As to its antiquity, the letter itself tells us (chap. 13) that it was written very near the martyrdom of Ignatius, (the year 107,) that is, only four years after John's death. We know that Polycarp had been a disciple of the apostles; "he had lived," as Irenæus[2] says, "in intimacy with men who had seen the Lord;" and as Jerome[3] reports, was placed over the church at Smyrna by the apostle John himself.

And as to its authenticity, we have the most unimpeachable guarantees; Irenæus, who, himself a disciple of Polycarp, could not be deceived about the letter, mentions it with high commendation;[4] Eusebius, who speaks of it more than once, quoting

[1] An evident allusion to Matt. x. 23.
[2] Contra Hæres., iii., 36.
[3] Catal. Script. Eccl., cap. xvii.
[4] In his third book, Contra Hæres., ch. iii.; and in Eusebius, (H. E., iv., 14.)

faithfully many passages from the ninth and thirteenth chapters, which are still found there; and Jerome[1] in his turn, who tells us of the high rank this epistle held in the esteem of the first Christians, and the use made of it in his time for public reading in many churches.

We find ourselves, then, very near the apostles, and by means of a most incontestable monument.

244. But it would be difficult to discover, even in our days, a composition more saturated with Scripture. Its Latin translation does not occupy more than seven pages in the octavo text of Hefele; and yet you may count at least forty or fifty quotations from the New Testament. The whole epistle, from one end to the other, reveals a piety which is immersed in the Sacred Word, and thinks in apostolic language.

We may form some estimate of it from the first chapter. It opens in the apostolic style:—"Polycarp and the presbyters with him, to the church of God sojourning at Philippi. Mercy and peace from God the Almighty, and from the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, be multiplied to you! I greatly rejoice with you in our Lord Jesus Christ that you have received the copies of true charity, and that you have accompanied, as it became you, those who were bound in bonds worthy of saints, which are the diadems of the elect of God and of our Lord; and that the firm root of your faith, renowned from ancient times, (Phil. i. v.,) remains until now, and bears fruit unto our Lord Jesus Christ, who endured to face death for our sins, whom God raised, *having loosed the pains of Hades,* (λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου, Acts ii. 24,) *and in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory,* (1 Pet. i. 8;) a joy into which many of you desire to enter, knowing that ye are *saved by grace, not of works,* (Eph. ii. 8, 9,) but by the will of God, through Jesus Christ."

Here, then, we see the contemporary of the last years of the apostles, who, in a very short chapter, shews himself so filled with their writings that he scatters them abroad in superabundance. It is like a man who gives his national accent to every word he utters. We have just heard him quote, in quick succession, with-

[1] Catal. Script. Eccl., cap. xvii.

out effort, without even naming them, three or four scriptures of the New Testament, and shew his readers that, like them, he carried at the same time on the tablet of his memory the Book of Acts, the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, the Epistles to the Philippians, and the catholic Epistle of Peter; and that he mixed them with his own thoughts in one continued discourse. And if such was his first chapter, such also, we shall find, will be the thirteen others.

The second begins at once with the words of St Peter, and however short, it gives evidence, especially in the Greek, that the author had before him the Gospels of Luke and of Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Paul, and the first of Peter. "Wherefore," he says, "having girded up your loins, (διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας ὑμῶν, 1 Pet. i. 13,) *serve the Lord with fear*, (Ps. ii. 2,) forsaking *vain-babbling*, (τὴν κενὴν ματαιολογίαν, 1 Tim. i. 6,) and the error of the multitude, *believing in Him who has raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and given Him glory*, (1 Pet. i. 21,) *and made Him sit at His right hand; to whom are subject all things*, heavenly and terrestrial, whom every breath worships, who comes *as judge of the living and of the dead*, (Acts xvii. 31,) and whose blood God will require of those who do not believe in Him. But *He who raised Him from the dead will raise us also*, if we do His will, and walk in His commandments, and love what He loves; abstaining from all injustice, fraud, avarice, evil-speaking, and false witnessing; *not rendering evil for evil, nor railing for railing*, (ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, 1 Pet. iii. 9,) *nor a blow for a blow, nor cursing for cursing;* being mindful of what the Lord said when teaching, (Matt. v. 2, vii. 1,) *Judge not, that ye be not judged; forgive, and it shall be forgiven you*, (Luke vi. 2; Matt. vi. 12, 14;) *with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again*, (Matt. vii. 2;) and *blessed are the poor and persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God*," (Luke vi. 30.)

Certainly these two chapters will be sufficient to characterise Polycarp and his age as far as the canon is concerned; but we should like to quote the third, since it is very short, and the holy bishop makes a more direct mention in it of Paul and his writings,

in reference to the inspired epistle which they had received fifty years before.

245. Chapter iii. :—"These things I have written to you, my brethren, concerning righteousness, not arrogating anything to myself, but because you have invited me. For neither I nor any one like me can attain to the wisdom (*τῇ σοφίᾳ*, 2 Pet. iii. 15) of the blessed Paul, who, when he was among you, taught accurately and firmly in the presence of the men who then lived the words concerning the truth; and who, when absent, *wrote epistles* to you, into which, if you look closely, you will be enabled to be built up in the faith given to you."

246. The fourth chapter, on avarice, begins in the same way, with textual quotations from the first Epistle to Timothy, (vi. 10,) and from the Epistle to the Ephesians, (vi. 11;) the fifth chapter with a quotation from the Epistle to the Galatians, (vi. 7,) and with some very clear allusions (in the Greek) to 1 Tim. iii. 8; to 2 Tim. ii. 12; to Philip. i. 27; to 1 Pet. ii. 11; to 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; the sixth chapter with allusions to 2 Cor. v. 10; to the Epistle to the Romans xii. 17; and to the Gospels of Luke (vi. 38) and Matthew (vii. 2;) the seventh chapter with these words, from 1 John iv. 3, "*Whosoever confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is an antichrist;*" and he adds, "Whoever does not confess the testimony of the cross, is of the devil; therefore, leaving the vanity of the multitude and false doctrines, let us return to the word given us from the beginning, (Jude iii.,) *watching unto prayer*, (1 Pet. iv. 7,) and beseeching in our supplications the all-seeing God not to *lead us into temptation*, (Matt. vi. 13,) according to what the Lord said, *The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak*," (Matt. xxvi. 14; or Mark xiv. 38.)

247. The seven last chapters present the same characteristics. The eighth chapter, and the two following quote textually, without naming the apostle, the First Epistle of Peter, (ii. 24, 22, 17, iv. 16, 11, 12;) while the eleventh chapter, on the other hand, expressly names St Paul, repeating this passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians—"*Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?*" as Paul teaches; and chapter the twelfth begins and goes on with these remarkable words—"*I hope that you are well exercised in* THE SACRED LETTERS. As it is said in the

Scriptures, *Be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath,* (Eph. iv. 26.) *Pray for all the saints,* (Eph. vi. 18;) *pray also for kings, and powers, and princes,* (1 Tim. ii. 2,) *and for them that hate you and persecute you,*" (Matt. v. 44.)

In truth, when we have read these chapters of Polycarp, in which the New Testament abounds and overflows, we ask ourselves how the unbelieving criticism of Germany could take so much pains to dispute or invalidate the testimony of Justin Martyr, which comes fifty-three years later, and how believing criticism can take such pains, on the other hand, to defend it. Here we see what the New Testament was already in Asia Minor, and at Philippi, in Macedonia, four years only after John's death—what it was to a martyr, the immediate disciple of that apostle, and in the very localities in which he had resided so long!

But on this subject we shall mention one word from his thirteenth and last chapter, and shall be able to recognise with advantage the care which all the churches took to edify one another by the reciprocal communication of the letters they received from the servants of God. "You have written to me," said Polycarp, "and Ignatius also has written to me, that if any one should be coming (from Smyrna) into Syria, he should bring your letters thither, and if I should find opportunity, I will do it myself, or send by some other person for you. We have sent to you the letters of Ignatius, and others, as many as we have, as you requested. You will gain much fruit from them, for they embrace lessons of faith, and patience, and every kind of edification."

Thus the letter of this great servant of the Lord concludes, and we love to recall these last traits, because they make us understand that if the churches and their bishops already took such pains to collect the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp, and if the Philippians asked for them as fitted to edify them, with how much more vigilant and religious earnestness must these same churches have collected and transmitted during fifty years the inspired epistles of the Lord's own apostles. We also learn from other historical monuments that in some churches they preserved with special care the original texts, and we have already cited, in reference to this fact, a remarkable expression of Tertullian.

We now pass on to Ignatius, to his martyrdom, and his letters.

SECTION FIFTH.

IGNATIUS, HIS MARTYRDOM AND LETTERS.

248. Ignatius was one of the hearers of St John, and, if we may believe Chrysostom,[1] he was placed over the Church at Antioch by the Apostle Peter himself. Eusebius, it is true, places him after Evodius, (H. E., iii. 22;) but the "Apostolic Constitutions," (vii. 46,) indicate rather that these two men of God presided simultaneously in Antioch, the one by the appointment of Peter over the Jewish Christians, and the other by that of Paul over the uncircumcised Christians.

However that may be, it is certain that Ignatius, having been condemned to the wild beasts by the Emperor Trajan, when that prince was preparing at Antioch for his first expedition against the Armenians and Parthians, was sent to Rome under an escort of ten soldiers to undergo that dreadful punishment. On reaching Smyrna he had the consolation of being able to visit Polycarp, and at last landing at Ostra, he was conducted to Rome, where two lions devoured him in the sight of the Roman people. This was in the tenth year of Trajan, the year 107.

249. The "Acts" of this martyr, written and published by ocular witnesses (*τούτων αὐτόπται γενόμενοι*, ch. vii.,) were edited for the first time by Archbishop Usher in 1647. We can recognise distinctly the New Testament in the second page. When the emperor, elated by his triumphs over the Scythians and Dacians, beheld Ignatius before his tribunal, he hastened to treat with contempt the Christian words of the martyr. "You carry, then, within you, Him who was crucified?"—"Yes," replied Ignatius, "FOR IT IS WRITTEN, *I will dwell in them, and I will walk in them*, (*Ναί, γέγραπται γάρ ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω.*)" These are the exact Greek expressions in 2 Cor. vi. 16, and not those of the LXX. in Leviticus xxvi. 12.

"Yes! FOR IT IS WRITTEN." These, then, are the words uttered in the year 107 before the tribunal of a Roman emperor, within four years of the death of St John! Such is the language, mark you, of the most illustrious bishop of the East, when appearing in

[1] Hom. in S. Ignat. Martyr., cap. iv.

his own city of Antioch before the renowned conqueror of the Scythians and Dacians! Not only he confesses himself a Christian before the whole empire, and at the hazard of his life; but he declares that for Christians everything is decided when they can say, "IT IS WRITTEN!" This is their rule, and by these words their faith is justified, their course is marked out, and every mode of death is good to them. On hearing these words, Trajan replied, "We ordain that Ignatius, who says that he carries about the Crucified within him, be chained and conducted by soldiers to great Rome, that he may become the food of wild beasts for the pleasure of the people, (*βρῶμα γενησόμενον θηρίων εἰς τέρψιν τοῦ δήμου.*)"

We pass on to his letters, all three written some weeks before his martyrdom.

250. Fifteen letters ascribed to this father have been published; but the unanimous opinion of the learned has long since rejected eight as evident forgeries.[1] Only a controversy has been carried on respecting the Greek text of the seven others, as an edition of them has been extant evidently more extended, and suspected of numerous interpolations. From the middle of the nineteenth century to the present day, a great number of the most distinguished scholars, Vossius, Usher, Le Clerc, Grabe, Pearson, (and, recently, Hefele,) have given the preference to the shorter recension. Such was the state of things when, in 1845, the learned Orientalist, Dr Cureton, published a very ancient Syriac version of the Epistles of Ignatius, discovered, six years before, by Dr Henry Tattam, in an ancient monastery of Upper Egypt. The manuscript is of the sixth century; but the version, most probably, is of much greater antiquity. Cureton has published a beautiful edition; in preparing which he made use of another Syriac manuscript of the epistles of Ignatius, found by him in the British Museum. The whole is accompanied with the Greek text, and an English translation. But this collection contains only three epistles,—the first, to the Ephesians; the second, to the Romans; the third, to Polycarp; and further, it has been satisfactorily ascertained that the extravagant passages on the episcopate, which have hitherto presented to impartial readers the appearance of an

[1] Among the rest are two addressed to St John, and one to the Virgin Mary.

awkward anachronism, were really interpolations. We shall, therefore, take our quotations only from Dr Cureton's text, and content ourselves with saying, with Bunsen, that in the present day all critics reject the authenticity of the ancient text, "unless some Romanists, among whom," (he says,) "only Dr Hefele deserves to be mentioned."[1]

These three epistles of Ignatius, after the reductions called for by the Syriac text, do not occupy more than ten or eleven pages octavo in the Latin text of Hefele.

251. The Epistle to the Ephesians, although reduced, at most, to two pages and a half, yet abounds in allusions to Paul's epistles. It begins in the style of the apostolic epistles; and in his salutation we at once recognise (especially in the Greek) most distinct reminiscences of the Epistle to the Ephesians, (i. 4, 19, iii. 11, 19, iv. 3,)—"Ignatius to the church which is blessed in the greatness and plenitude of the Father, ordained before the ages to be always united in permanent, immutable glory, and elected in the true passion, by the will of the Father, and of Jesus Christ our God, to the church which is at Ephesus, in Asia, be abundance of joy in Jesus Christ, and in grace."

This style often reproduces elsewhere expressions peculiar to Paul. (*Μιμηταὶ ὄντες*, Eph. v. 1; *ἑδραῖοι τῇ πίστει*, Col. i. 23.)

"Being imitators of God," (he says at the beginning,) "revivified by the blood of God, you have accomplished the work of the brotherhood; for having heard, since my departure from Syria, that I am in bonds for our common hope and name, you have been anxious to visit me, who hope to obtain by your prayers to combat the beasts at Rome, and to obtain by martyrdom to be a true disciple of Him who offered Himself for us to God, an oblation and a sacrifice, (*τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκόντος Θεῷ προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*, Eph. v. 2.)"

252. As to his beautiful and holy Epistle to Polycarp, though reduced in like manner to less than two pages and a half, it recalls with the same clearness the language of the New Testament. "*Give yourself to continual prayers*," he says to his friend, (*προσευχαῖς σχόλαζε ἀδιαλείπτοις*,) expressions familiar to St Paul, (1 Cor. vii. 5; Rom. i. 9; 1 Thess. v. 17.) "*Be prudent*

[1] Hippolytus and his Age, vol. i., pp. 58, 59. Vol. iv., Preface. London, 1852.

as a serpent in all things," he adds, "*and simple as a dove,* (Matt. x. 16.) Be temperate as an athlete of God—the prize is immortality and eternal life. Exhort my brethren to love their companions as *the Lord loveth the Church,* (Eph. v. 25, 29,) that all things may be done for the honour of God, (1 Cor. x. 31.) Please Him to whose army you belong, and from whom you will receive your pay, *ἀρέσκετε ᾧ στρατεύσθε.*" (See 2 Tim. ii. 4.)

253. Lastly, in his Epistle to the Romans, the least interpolated of the three, we find the same character. "I write to the churches," he says, "and make them all know that I die voluntarily for God. I pray you not to hinder me by an untimely kindness. Rather entreat Christ on my behalf, that by these instruments (the wild beasts) I may be found a victim. I do not give you commands, like Peter or Paul. They are apostles, I am a condemned man; they are free, but I am even now a slave. But if I suffer, I shall be a freeman of Jesus, (*ἀπελεύθερος Ἰησοῦ,* 1 Cor. vii. 22,) and I shall rise again free in Him. I am bound to ten leopards, by which I mean a company of soldiers; but I learn much from their bad treatment; *but for this I am not justified,* (*ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμαι,* 1 Cor. iv. 2, 4.) I do not take delight in corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life. I wish to have the *bread of God,* which is the flesh of Christ, and His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life."

But we pass on, in the last place, to the most ancient and authentic monument of apostolic antiquity, the inestimable epistle of Clement; and we think it proper to give rather longer quotations.

Section Sixth.

THE EPISTLE OF CLEMENT OF ROME TO THE CORINTHIANS.

254. This beautiful monument, so worthy of the apostolic age, forms a splendid close to the chain of historical testimonies which connects the days of Ignatius and Irenæus with those of Paul and the other inspired writers. We find in it an abundance of everything we have a right to expect from a pious writer of the age in which the New Testament was completed; for the author, filled with the remembrance of the apostles, of their doctrine, and their Epistles, reproduces their expressions of faith, and speaks their

language. Like them, he quotes most freely the ancient Scriptures, which they read every Sabbath in all their assemblies. He also cites the words of Jesus, as reported by Matthew, Mark, and Luke; but, in citing them, he does not give himself the trouble of naming the sacred historians. He often employs, and in their strictest sense, the familiar expressions of Paul. With a holy simplicity, he recalls to the Corinthians the epistle they had received from that apostle, fifteen or sixteen years before, and affirms that it was written by the Holy Spirit. In a word, you will find this epistle such, in all respects, as would be in character with that Clement whom Paul, writing from Rome about the year 60, had called his "fellow-labourer," and "whose name," he said, "was written in the book of life," (Phil. iv. 3.)

But when, and why was this epistle written? What is its authenticity? And how has it come into our possession? On these points we must touch before going any further.

255. This epistle was written by Clement in the name of the church at Rome to that of the Corinthians, which some factious persons violently agitated against their own pastors.

Origen, (on John i. 29,) Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii., 15,) Epiphanius, (*Haer.*, xxxvii., 6,) Jerome, (*Catal.*, xv.,) and others, agree in regarding our author as indisputably the same Clement of whom the apostle speaks in his Epistle to the Philippians, (iv. 3.) And as the Scripture has not named this person elsewhere, and Paul, when he visited Philippi, (Acts xvi.,) had with him only Silas, Luke, and Timothy, we must suppose that he found Clement in this Roman colony, and that he left him there to carry on his evangelical labours, till about the year 60. But was this Clement a Roman, as might be inferred from his Latin name? or was he an Israelite, as Tillemont has conjectured from some expressions in the epistles, (*our father Jacob, our father Abraham*, and others)?[1] We cannot decide. That he was bishop of Rome all affirm. But whether he was the first after Peter, as Jerome thought, or the second, as Augustin believed, or the third, as Irenæus[2] affirms, after all, little concerns us. Eusebius assures us that he presided nine years over the church at Rome; but

[1] Hefele, Proleg., p. 20.

[2] Lib. iii., cap. iii.; and Eusebius, Hist. Eccl, v., 6.

where are we to place these nine years? According to all appearance from 68 to 77; for the epistle itself, (chap. i.,) by informing us that it was written a little time after a violent persecution, points necessarily to that of Nero, at the time of Paul's martyrdom, (from 65 to 68.) That of Domitian, which followed in 96, appears much less probable, for many reasons given by Grabe, Galland, Wotton, Hefele, and others. In fact, Clement (in the fifth chapter) mentions as recent the martyrdom of Paul and Peter; besides, he describes in the sixth chapter this persecution as cruel from the great number of martyrs, while that of Diocletian was more noted for the high rank of its victims; and, lastly, the fortieth and forty-first chapters attest that the epistle was written at a time when the temple-worship was still celebrated, and, therefore, necessarily before the year 70, when Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus.

We say nothing of the career, martyrdom, nor strange miracles which the Roman Breviary[1] ascribes to Clement. No historian has spoken of them—neither Irenæus, nor Eusebius, nor even Jerome.

256. The epistle of Clement, which our Reformers believed to be irreparably and long ago lost, was at first highly honoured for five or six centuries by all the ancient fathers. They were delighted most unanimously to recommend it; the numerous quotations they have made from it fully guarantee the authority of the edition we possess in the present day; for we find them in it, word for word. Polycarp often speaks as having had it in his hands; Irenæus calls it *ἱκανωτάτην*; Clement of Alexandria mentions it six times; Origen three times; and Eusebius calls it "great and admirable," (*μεγάλην τε καὶ θαυμασίαν*;) Cyril of Jerusalem cites it in like manner; so does Epiphanius; Jerome cites it many times, and calls it "*valde utilem*," (*Catal. Scrip.*, cxv.,) adding, that in his time it was the custom in certain places to read it publicly. In like manner, Photius[2] in the ninth century. But at a later period, and during all the Middle Ages, it had disappeared.

[1] Of November 23. It exiles him to the Crimea—makes him fall into the Black Sea with an anchor round his neck—makes the sea retire three miles before his corpse, and his body appear on the shore with his anchor, his shrine of stone, and his chapel of marble.

[2] Biblioth., cod. cxiii.

Scholars, at the revival of letters, as well as the Reformers, had often lamented its loss; till at last, in 1628, Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, having made a present to Charles I. of England, of the famous Alexandrian manuscript of the Scriptures, the learned world was agreeably surprised to discover this ancient, long-lost treasure, written on the last leaves of the manuscript.[1] The University of Oxford printed[2] it for the first time in 1638. Wotton published at Cambridge, in 1718, an edition carefully edited, but that of Dr Jacobson, published with learned notes at Oxford 1838 and 1840, is regarded as superior to all that preceded it.

When this interesting book reappeared, many critics, such as Bignon, Le Clerc, and Mosheim, suspected its integrity; but in our day all serious doubts, Hefele says, have ceased, (Prolog., p. xxxiii.;) and all modern scholars, without exception, are unanimous in acknowledging both the authenticity and integrity of this ancient document.

257. To render intelligible the value of its testimony in favour of the canon, no reasoning can avail so much as the simple process of passing a rapid analysis of its contents under the eyes of the reader. Its fifty-nine short chapters occupy but thirty-three pages and a half in the octavo text of Hefele.[3]

The frank and pious simplicity of this piece, worthy of primitive times, the elevation and apostolic purity of its doctrine,[4] distinguish it from all subsequent writings. Wotton, in the preface to his edition, says, "It is the style and method of the New Testament; nothing appears in it which is not entirely worthy of an apostolic man." "It speaks of doctrines," Grotius[5] has remarked, "without subtlety or disguise; it employs the terms *vocation* and *election*, *called* and *chosen*, in a perfectly Pauline sense." And as to its mode of citing the Scriptures, it is equally that of the apostles; that is to say, it takes almost all its quota-

[1] It wants but one leaf, entirely torn out at the end of chap. lvii. by the ignorant awkwardness of the binder. See the note in Hefele, Patr. Apost. Opera, p. 135.

[2] Or its librarian, Junius.

[3] From forty-one pages of his Greek text, we deduct seven pages and a half occupied with notes.

[4] Notwithstanding his belief in the pretended natural phenomenon of the phœnix, and one or two expressions which might have been better weighed.

[5] Epist. ad Bignonium.

tions from the Old Testament, and its employment of the scriptures of the New is much more rare. When it cites the words of Jesus Christ, already recorded in the first Gospels, it is without naming the place; when it adduces expressly one of Paul's epistles,[1] it is as Peter had[2] already done; and when it cites them indirectly, it is often by reproducing entire phrases, but without taking the trouble to state whence they are taken. It often introduces into its language the most characteristic expressions of the apostolic writings, expressions which had become familiar to the members of the primitive Church, and recognised by every one as soon as they were uttered.

It was very natural that Clement of Rome, writing so soon after the death of Paul, should follow entirely the method of the apostles; and his epistle would have been justly suspected if it had then made the same copious use of the New Testament which was made at a later period, as, for example, by Bishop Polycarp. It must not be forgotten, that in the times of his epistle, the Church of the New Testament had received only a part of its inspired scriptures, and that its canon was not closed till thirty years after. The Gospel of Mark, that of John, as well as his two last epistles, and that of Jude, were not yet in existence, nor the Apocalypse. And even that "epistle of the blessed Paul, (*τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου,*)" of which he speaks in his forty-seventh chapter, had appeared only fifteen years before, (in the year 53.)

But we shall better judge of the character of his epistle, and its quotations, when we have gone through our rapid survey of it.

258. Chapter. i. *The salutation*:—

"The church of God which sojourns at Rome to the church of God sojourning at Corinth—to the called, sanctified according to the will of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, grace and peace be multiplied from the omnipotent God through Jesus Christ.

"In consequence of the sudden calamities and accidents that have befallen us, beloved, we have been slower in attending to

[1] His First Epistle to the Corinthians.

[2] 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16, as we shall see especially in the Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Hebrews.

your requests, and to that detestable and unholy revolt, so contrary and foreign to the elect of God, which a few rash and bold persons have lighted up among you, so that your honourable and illustrious name, worthy to be beloved by all men, has been greatly dishonoured."

Chapter ii. *The exemplary conduct of the Corinthians before their schism:—*

"Who has remained some time among you without admiring your faith, so firm, your piety, so sober, your hospitality, so generous, your knowledge of the truth, so perfect and so firm? All things were done by you without respect of persons, (*ἀπροσωπολήπτως*.)[1] You were subject to your leaders, and gave due honours to the elders (*τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις*) who were among you.

"You were all of a humble mind, without vain-glory; disposed rather to be subject yourselves than to subject others; giving more willingly than taking away; satisfied with the supplies furnished by God; and, carefully attending to His words, you preserved them in your vitals, and His sufferings were before your eyes, (Gal. iii. 1.) There was a contest (of prayer) (*ἀγών*, Gal. ii. 1,) day and night for *all the brotherhood*, (*ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος*,)[2] that the number of the elect might be saved. . . . All sedition and all schism were an abomination to you. . . . *You were ready for every good work*," (Titus iii. 1.)

Chapter iii. *Their sad state since their divisions:—*

"But your prosperity has produced among you jealousy, envy, contention and faction, persecution and anarchy, war and captivity."

Chapter iv. *From this source the greatest evils for a long time have issued for the people of God:—*

"It was envy and jealousy which caused the death of Abel—persecuted Joseph—excited Moses—placed Aaron and Miriam without the camp, and brought ruin on Dathan and Abiram." . . .

Chapters v. and vi.:—"But let us leave these ancient examples and come to recent times, contemplating Paul and Peter, and other *athletæ* who have combated nearest us, (*ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔγγιστα γενομένους*

[1] He speaks here like Paul and James—James ii. 1-9; Eph. vi. 9; Rom. ii. 11; Col. iii. 25; Acts x. 34.

[2] An expression peculiar to Peter—1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9.

ἀθλητάς.) Let us take the generous examples *of our generation*, (τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν.) On account of envy and jealousy (διὰ ξῆλον καὶ φθόνον) the greatest and most righteous *pillars* (Gal. ii. 9) have been persecuted even unto death. Let us place before our eyes the good apostles. On account of unjust zeal, Peter endured, not one or two, but many labours, and thus, suffering martyrdom, he went to the place of glory which was due to him, (ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης.) It was through envy, and on account of jealousy, too, that Paul sustained the combat and obtained the reward of endurance, (ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέσχεν.) He was seven times thrown into bonds, obliged to flee, and was stoned, and, having become a herald of the Word in the East and the West, he acquired the glorious renown of his faith, taught the whole world righteousness; coming to the boundary (τὸ τέρμα) of the West, he suffered martyrdom in the time of the governors, (ἐπὶ τῶν Ἡγουμένων.)[1] Thus he was released from the world, and went into the holy place, having been the greatest pattern of endurance."

Chapters vii. and viii. *Exhortation to repentance*:—

"We write these things, beloved, not only to exhort you to duty, but to remind ourselves, for we are here in the same arena, and have the same contest before us. . . . Let us look steadfastly on the blood of Christ, and consider how precious to God is His blood, which, having been shed for our salvation, proffers the grace of repentance to the whole world. Let us go back to all generations, and learn that in every generation the Lord has given place for repentance (μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης) to all who are willing to turn to Him. Noah preached repentance, (ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, 2 Pet. ii. 5,) and those who listened to him were saved."

Chapters ix.–xii. *The examples of the saints*:—

"Consider Enoch, who, being found just in obedience, *was translated, and his death was not found*, (Heb. xi. 5.) Noah, being found faithful by his ministry, preached *regeneration* (παλιγγενεσίαν) to the world. Abraham, who was called *the friend of God*, (James ii. 23; Heb. xi. 8,) was found faithful,

[1] That is to say, under Tibellinus and Sabinus, who *governed* during the last year of Nero.

because he obeyed the words of God. *He believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness,* (Rom. iv. 3.) On account of his hospitality and piety, Lot was saved from Sodom, (2 Pet. ii. 6, 7.) For her faith and hospitality Rahab the harlot was saved," (Heb. xi. 31.)

Chapter xiii. *Exhortation to humility:—*

"Let us be humble in spirit, (*ταπεινοφρονήσωμεν,*)[1] my brethren. Let us lay aside all boasting and conceit, and folly and anger, and do what is written; for the Holy Spirit saith, *Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, nor the strong in his strength, nor the rich in his wealth; but let him that glorieth glory in the Lord,* (Jer. ix. 23; 2 Cor. x. 17; 1 Cor. i. 31.) Let us, above all, remember the words of the Lord Jesus, which He spoke, teaching equity and long-suffering; for He said, (Luke vi. 36–38; Matt. vi. 12–15; 1 Cor. i. 31,) *Be ye merciful, that ye may have mercy; forgive, and it shall be forgiven you; as ye do, so shall it be done to you; as you give, so shall it be given to you; as you judge, so shall you be judged; as you are kind, so shall kindness be shewn to you,* (*ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν;*) *with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*"

Chapters xiv., xv. *We must obey God rather than man, and join the lovers of peace:—*

"It is just and pious, my brethren, that we should obey God, rather than follow the leaders of a detestable schism in pride and insubordination. Let us cleave to those who live in peace with piety," (*τοῖς μετ' εὐσεβείας εἰρηνεύουσιν,* an expression of Paul, Rom. xii. 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 13.)

Chapter xvi. *Christ the pattern of humility:—*

"Christ is theirs who think lowly of themselves; not theirs who elevate themselves above His flock. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the sceptre of the majesty of God, did not come in the pomp of pride and arrogance, however powerful, but in humility, as the Holy Spirit spoke concerning Him, for He said, *Lord, who hath believed our report,* &c. . . . And again He said, *I am a worm, and no man; the reproach of men, and the scorn of the people.* Consider, then, beloved, what an example He has given to us!"

[1] This is a favourite word with Paul (Acts xx. 19; Eph. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18, 33, iii. 32) and with Peter (1 Pet. v. 5.)

Chapters xvii., xviii.:—"Let us imitate the humility of Abraham, of Jacob, of Moses, of David.

"Be imitators of them who wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, (Heb. xi. 37,) preaching the coming of Christ. We speak of Elias, Elisha, and Ezekiel, the prophets, and with *them those who have obtained a testimony,* (*καὶ τοὺς μεμαρτυρημένους.*)"

Let us take notice of this passive expression, frequently used by Luke and Paul, (Acts vi. 3, x. 22, xvi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 10; Heb. xi. 2, 4, 5, 30.) Thus Abraham received an eminent testimony, and was called the friend of God, because he said in his humility, "I am but dust and ashes." Thus Job; thus Moses, who was called *faithful in all his house,* (Num. xii. 7; Heb. iii. 2;) thus David. . . .

Chapter xix.:—"Let us also seek peace *after their example.*

"Receive, then, the instruction of humility and obedience which is offered to us by so many great men, to whom the Scriptures have given such testimonies; and let us contemplate the mercy and long-suffering of God towards His whole creation."

Chapter xx. *Does not the government of the world shew that God is pleased with harmony and peace?*—

"Consider the heavens, the seasons, the sun and moon, the choir of stars, the earth, the ocean, day and night—how all creatures are harmoniously submissive to His sovereign will; and let us acknowledge that He is the friend of peace and of good order, beneficent towards all, but superabundantly to us who have taken refuge in His compassions, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Chapters xxi. xxii. *Submit yourselves to order in everything before God:*—

"Consider how near He is, and none of our thoughts or reasonings are hidden from Him. He is a searcher of the thoughts and intentions, (*ἐρευνητὴς γὰρ ἐστιν ἐννοιῶν καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων,* Heb. iv. 12.)"

Chapter xxiii. *Be humble and true. Remember that Christ will come again:*—

"This is why we approach to Him with a simple mind. Wherefore, *let us not be double-minded,* *μὴ διψυχῶμεν,* (*δίψυχος,* a word peculiar to James i. 8, iv. 8.) Let that scripture be far from us which says, Miserable are *the double-minded or the undecided,*

(δίψυχοι,) *whose soul is in doubt, who say, We have heard these things even in the times of our fathers, and behold, we are grown old, and none of these things have happened to us.*" "Clement combines here," Wotton remarks, "James and Peter (2 Pet. iii. 3, 4) in his recollections; for the Scripture bears this joint testimony, (συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς,) *that the Lord will come quickly, and will not tarry!* (Heb. x. 37;) *and the Lord will suddenly come to His temple, and the Holy One whom ye expect,*" (Mal. iii. 1.)

Chapters xxiv.–xxvii. *God teaches us the future resurrection continually even in nature:—*

"Consider, beloved, how the Lord shews us continually the future resurrection, of which he has made the Lord Jesus Christ the first-fruits, (ἀπαρχή, 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23,) having raised Him from the dead. Let us behold the fruits of the earth; how was the sowing effected? *The sower went forth,* and cast seed into the earth, (Luke viii. 5,) and the seed being scattered, those that fell dry and naked into the ground are decomposed. The greatness of Divine Providence raises the same, and many are produced from one, and bring forth fruit."

Chapters xxvii.–xxx. *Let us rely on God's promises, and draw nigh to Him in sanctity of heart:—*

"He who commands us not to deceive will certainly himself not deceive, for nothing is impossible to God, except to speak falsehood, (Tit. i. 2; Heb. vi. 18.) Let us approach, therefore, to Him in sanctity of soul, raising pure and undefiled hands to Him," (1 Tim. ii. 18.)

Chapter xxxi. *How shall we obtain the Divine blessing unless, like Abraham, by faith?—*

"Let us cleave to His blessing, and let us see what are the ways of blessing. On account of what was our Father Abraham blessed? Was it not that by faith he practised righteousness and truth? In the same manner Isaac, in confidence, knowing what would happen, willingly became a victim. Jacob, with humility, left his country on account of his brother, and made himself a slave, and the twelve sceptres of Israel were given to him."

Chapter xxxii. *We are justified, not by works, but by faith:—*

"Whoever will meditate on these things with sincerity will

acknowledge the greatness of the gifts which were bestowed upon him, for from him were all the priests and Levites who were employed about the altar of God; from him *was our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh,* (Rom. ix. 5;) from him were kings, governors, and leaders of the tribe of Judah. But all these obtained glory and grandeur, not by themselves, nor by their works, nor by just dealing, (δικαιοπραγίας,) which they practised, (ἧς κατειργάσαντο,) but by His will, (Rom. iii. 23, v. 2, vii. 18, ix. 11, 32; Tit. iii. 5, 7; Eph. ii. 9.) And we, being called by His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, (James i. 18; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11,) nor by our own wisdom, or understanding, or piety, or works which we have accomplished in holiness of heart, but by faith, (Rom. iv. 16, v. 1, iii. 24, i. 16, 17,) by which, from the beginning, God the Almighty justifies all those whom He has justified. To Him be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

Chapter xxxiii. *But we must not neglect love, and good works:—*

"What, then, shall we do, brethren? Shall we cease from doing good, and forsake charity? By no means does the Lord suffer this; but we must hasten with earnestness and readiness to fulfil every good work. He has created us for this. Let us apply ourselves, then, to works of righteousness. Let our glory and confidence be in Him, and let us be subject to His will."

Chapter xxxiv. *Let us live, then, in concord, and pray together to God for it:—*

"We are led by conscience into a holy concord, and animated by one spirit; let us cry ardently to Him as with one mouth, that we may *become partakers of His great and glorious promises,* (2 Pet. i. 4;)[1] for he has said, *Eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man, what things He hath prepared for them that wait for Him.*" We find these words imperfectly in Isaiah lxiv. 3, 4; but they are read almost literally in 1 Cor. ii. 9.

Chapter xxxv. *The gifts of God are admirable:—*

"How blessed and wonderful, beloved, are the gifts of God! Life in immortality, splendour in righteousness, truth in liberty,

[1] Yet the Greek words of Peter are not identical.

faith in confidence, self-government (*ἐγκράτεια*) in sanctity! And all these fall under the cognisance of our understanding. What, then, are those things that are prepared for those that wait for Him?"

Chapter xxxvi. *All this blessedness is obtained through Christ:—*

"This is the way, beloved, in which we find our salvation, Jesus Christ, *the High Priest of our oblations,* (*ἀρχιερέα,* Heb. iv. 15, viii. 1-3,) the protector and helper of our weakness. By Him let us look to the heights of heaven; by Him let us contemplate, as in a mirror, His pure and sublime countenance; by Him the eyes of our heart have been opened, (*ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας,* Eph. i. 18;) by Him our stupid and darkened mind (*ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν*) has revived into His marvellous light, (*εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς,* Rom. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 19;) by Him the Sovereign Lord has willed that we should taste immortal knowledge. *Being the brightness of his majesty,* (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ,* Heb. i. 3, 4,) *he is so much greater than the angels as he has inherited a more excellent name,* (Heb. i. 7;) for it is written, *Who maketh his angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire; but concerning his Son the Lord said, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee, &c. And again he saith to him, Sit at my right hand till I make thy enemies thy footstool,* (Heb. i. 5, 13.) And who are these *enemies?* The wicked; those who set themselves in opposition to the will of God."

Chapter xxxvii. *Let us be, then, devoted soldiers of Jesus Christ:—*

"Let us fight, brethren, as soldiers of Christ, (2 Tim. ii. 3, 4,) with all earnestness, according to His irreproachable orders. Consider what soldiers are under their generals,—what order, what obedience, what submission! All are not tribunes, nor chiliarchs, nor centurions. Each one in his own rank fulfils the commands of the king and the generals. The great cannot exist without the little, nor the little without the great. All are mixed; and hence their use and their power." . . . .

Chapter xxxviii. *Let every one among us place himself under Christ's orders:—*

"Let every one *be subject to his neighbour*, (*ὑποτασσέσθω*, Eph. v. 21; 1 Pet. v. 5,) according to the order in which he has been placed by the grace of Christ. Let not the strong neglect the weak; let the weak pay respect to the strong."

Chapters xxxix.–xlii. *We cannot raise ourselves. We must submit, therefore, to the order established by God in the Church, and consider what it is:—*

"The apostles have proclaimed the gospel to us by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ by the command of God. Therefore, having received their orders, and by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ being full of assurance, and confirmed in the word of God, (*πληροφορηθέντες*, Rom. iv. 21; *πιστωθέντες*, 2 Tim. iii. 14—words altogether Pauline,) they went forth *with full assurance* (*πληροφορίας*, 1 Thess. i. 5) *of the Holy Spirit*, announcing *the good news of the coming of the reign of God*. Preaching the words through regions and cities, they ordained *their first-fruits*, (*καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν*,) having proved them by the Spirit, for bishops and deacons (overseers and servants) of those who would hereafter believe."

Chapter xliii. *Moses had contentions of the same kind:—*

"And is it, then, wonderful if those who have been intrusted in Christ with such an office by God (*ἐν Χριστῷ πιστευθέντες παρὰ Θεοῦ ἔργον τοιοῦτο*) should appoint those before mentioned? Do we not see the blessed Moses, *a faithful servant in all his house*, (Heb. iii. 5,) set down in the sacred books all that had been commanded him? (Num. xvii.) He acted thus lest sedition should arise among the people of Israel on the subject of the priesthood, and that the name of the true and only God (*τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ μόνου Θεοῦ*, John xvii. 3) might be glorified; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

Chapter xliv. *The apostles established bishops and deacons, and therefore it is a sin to reject those who fill these offices:—*

"The apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be contentions on the subject or dignity of *the episcopate*, (*ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*.) For this reason, having received perfect foreknowledge, they constituted those we have spoken of, and then gave this precept, *ἐπινομήν*, (an expression which some would translate *testamentary order*,) that when they had fallen

asleep, other approved men might receive their ministry, (*διαδέξωνται τὴν λειτουργίαν.*) Therefore we think that those who have been established by them, or afterwards by other eminent men, with the approval of all the Church, (*συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης,*) and who have served the flock of Christ in humility, without reproach, quietly, and liberally, (*ἀβαναύσως,*) having had for a long time the testimony of all,—such men, we think, cannot be justly ejected from their offices. This would not be on our part a light sin. And yet we see that you have removed some who acted honourably from an office which they had filled unblamably and with honour."

Chapter xlv. *It is the part of the wicked to persecute and expel the just:—*

"Ye are contentious, my brethren, and ye are zealots about things which do not pertain to salvation. TURN YOUR REGARDS[1] TO THE SCRIPTURES, THE TRUE SAYINGS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. There ye will never find the just rejected by holy men. The just have suffered persecution, but it was from the wicked; they have been thrown into prison, but it was by the impious." . . .

Chapter xlvi. *Adhere to the just; your dissension is pernicious:—*

"Why should there be among you contentions, wrath, divisions, schisms, and war? (James iv. 1.) Have we not one God and one Christ, (Eph. iv. 4, 6,) and one Spirit of grace shed upon us, and one calling in Christ? Why should we tear asunder and mangle the members of Christ, and forget that we are members one of another? (Eph. iv. 25.) Remember the words of our Lord Jesus, for He said, (Matt. xxvi. 24; Luke xvii. 2; Mark ix. 42,) *Woe to that man! it had been better for him never to have been born, than that he should offend one of my elect; it had been better for him to have had a millstone fastened to him, and to be drowned in the sea, than to offend one of my little ones.* Your schism has perverted many; it has thrown many into dejection, many into doubt, and all of us into grief; and your sedition is still enduring."

But, above all, hear Clement in his forty-seventh chapter, where he says expressly to the Corinthians that their present dissensions are worse than those in the time of Paul, fifteen years before.

[1] Ἐγκύπτετε—probably an allusion to 1 Pet. i. 12, *παρακύψαι.*

Chapter xlvii.:—"Take in your hands THE EPISTLE OF THE BLESSED APOSTLE PAUL. What did he write to you at first in the beginning of the gospel? Of a truth it was by the Holy Spirit that (ἐπ' αληθειας πνευματικῶς) he sent you his letter concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because at that time you were forming parties, (προσκλίσεις.) But those rendered you not so culpable as you are now; for your partiality had for its objects celebrated apostles, (Paul and Cephas,) and a man approved by them, (Apollos.) But now, on the contrary, consider who are those that pervert you, and who have lessened the high reputation of your fraternal love. It is shameful, beloved, and very shameful and unworthy of your life in Christ, to hear that the firmly-established and ancient church of the Corinthians,[1] by means of one or two persons, is in a state of revolt against its presbyters. And this rumour has extended not only to us, but to those who are alien from us; so that through your infatuation blasphemies are cast on the name of the Lord, (Rom. xi. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 1,) and danger is created for your church."

Chapter xlviii. *Return to brotherly love:—*

"Let us quickly remove this evil. Let us fall before your sovereign Master, and with tears implore His compassion, that He would be reconciled to us, and re-establish us in the venerable and pure relations of our brotherly love."

"Is there not some faithful man among you, (James iii. 13,) powerful in uttering knowledge, and pure in his actions? Let him shew himself more humble in proportion as he seems to be greater; and let him *seek the common profit of all, and not his own,*" (1 Cor. x. 33.)

Chapter xlix. *Follow after charity:—*

"Let him who has charity in Christ observe the precepts of Christ. Who can describe the bond of the love of God? Who is able to describe the greatness of its beauty? The height to which it carries us is inexpressible. Charity unites us to God; *charity covers a multitude of sins,* (1 Pet. iv. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 4.) Charity endures all things; charity bears all things; there is nothing mean in charity, nothing supercilious. Charity makes no schism; charity is not seditious; charity does all things in con-

[1] Founded in the year 49.

cord. . . . In charity all the elect of God are perfected; apart from charity nothing is pleasing to God; in charity the Lord has succoured us; on account of the charity which He has towards us our Lord Jesus Christ gave His blood for us, by the will of God, and His flesh for our flesh, and His soul for our souls," (Gal. i. 4; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9, 10.)

Chapter l. *Let us pray for charity:—*

"You see, beloved, how great and wonderful is charity. But who is capable of being found in it, excepting those whom God renders worthy? Let us pray, then, and ask of His mercy that we may live in charity, without reproach, and free from human partiality."

Chapter li. *Let the authors of your dissensions confess their sin.*

Chapter lii. *Such a confession will be pleasing to God.*

Chapter liii. *Recollect the charity of Moses towards his people:—*

. . . "O great Charity! O perfection never to be surpassed! The servant speaks freely to his Lord, and asks forgiveness for the people, or that he himself may be utterly destroyed with them."

Chapters liv., lv. *He who is full of charity will endure any loss, that peace may be restored to the Church:—*

"Who, then, among you is generous? who is compassionate? who is filled with charity? Let him say—If sedition, strife, and schisms have originated with me, I will withdraw; I will depart wherever you wish, and will do whatever is ordered by the people. Only let the flock of Christ live in peace with the constituted presbyters. He who acts thus will win great glory for himself in the Lord, and every place will receive him; for *the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,* (1 Cor. x. 26, 28; Ps. xxiv. 1.) These things they have done, and will do, who act as members of the polity of God, never to be repented of."

Chapter lvi. *Let us admonish and reprove one another. God will protect him who does not refuse correction:—*

"And let us also intercede for those who have fallen into some transgression, (Gal. vi. 1, ἔν τινι παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων,) that moderation and humility may be granted them, that they may yield not to us, but to the Divine will."

"Let us receive, then, this correction, (*παιδείαν,*) beloved, at which no one ought to be angry. For thus the Holy Word says, *Whom the Lord loveth he correcteth,* (*παιδεύει*;) *He scourgeth every son whom he receiveth,*" (Heb. xii. 6; Prov. iii. 12.)

Chapter lvii. *Let the authors of the sedition submit themselves to the elders, lest God destroy them:—*

"You, therefore, who laid the foundation of sedition, submit yourselves to the presbyters, (*ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις,* 1 Pet. v. 5,) and be corrected unto repentance, having bent the knees of your heart."

Chapter lviii. *May the Lord bless all those who have called upon Him:—*

"May God, the all-surveying, the absolute Master of spirits, and the Lord of all flesh, who chose the Lord Jesus Christ, and us through Him *for a peculiar people,* (*εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον,* Titus ii. 14,) give to every soul that has called upon His great and glorious name faith, fear, peace, endurance, long-suffering, continence, purity, and sober-mindedness, by our *High Priest and leader Jesus Christ; through Him be to Him glory and majesty, power and honour, both now and for ever. Amen.*"

Chapter lix. *May the brethren whom we have deputed to you soon return from Corinth in peace and with joy:—*

"Send them back to us quickly, that they may announce that the wished-for concord is restored, and that we may rejoice on account of your sound condition. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you, and with all in every place who are called by God to Himself; by whom to Him be glory, honour, power, majesty, and an eternal throne for ever and ever. Amen.*"

259. We see, then, that this epistle, in the three points of piety, discipline, and doctrine, bears all the characteristics we have a right to expect. As to discipline, Clement shews us only two orders of officers in the Church—(chap. 42)—bishops (or presbyters) and deacons, under the one and sovereign priesthood of Jesus Christ, (chap. xxvi.,) all the bishops (or all the presbyters) being appointed (*καταστα θέντες*) with the consent of the whole Church, (chap. 44,) and each church being exhorted to walk in peace (*εἰρηνεύετω*) with the constituted elders, (*καθεσταμένων.*) As to piety, it was that of the apostolic days, which consisted in being atten-

tive to the words of God, in living to Jesus Christ, and having His sufferings constantly before their eyes. And, lastly, as to doctrine, we see ourselves led back to the purest fountains of Christianity. None of those errors that at so early a period invaded the primitive churches; no exaltation of the priest, or of the Church, or of the sacraments, or of Peter, or of Mary. Christ was all—the Alpha and Omega—the beginning and the end. Everything was to be received by grace alone, through faith, (chap. 32,) conversion, and the forgiveness of sins, (chap. 36,) sanctification, and perseverance. To the eternal election of the Father everything was to be referred, the beginning and progress, assurance and glory. And yet, in the midst of this primitive purity, it might be perceived, as must needs be, that an inspired hand no longer held the pen, and that there could not be found, as in the New Testament, an infallible and well-weighed selection of all the words. Thus, in the twenty-fifth chapter, the author receives, as an ascertained fact of natural history, the fable of the Phœnix[1]—a harmless error, no doubt—but an error such as is not found in the canonical Scriptures. And thus, in chap. v., speaking of Peter, he places the faithful in glory before the return of Christ and the resurrection, which no inspired book has ever done. And thus, by the side of the purest statements of doctrine, we shall find, perhaps, one or two expressions less exactly balanced, which seem to attribute to human works what the Scriptures do not grant them,—expressions, nevertheless, which, when viewed more closely, may be explained according to the analogy of faith.[2]

260. Not to make our analysis of this epistle too long, we have found it necessary, though with regret, to omit almost entirely its continual quotations from the Old Testament. Yet this is one of its most striking features; they abound in it to such a degree that we may count more than a hundred in the thirty-three or thirty-four pages of the text. This is on an average three quota-

[1] Just as Herodotus reports it, (ii., 73,) and as all antiquity received it, (Tacitus, Annales, vi., 23; Suetonius, in Tiber., 53.)

[2] As far as actions are opposed to vain words, it may be said, (as in chap. xxx.,) ἔργοις δικαιούμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις. And again, as far as God is bound to keep His promises, it may be said, (as in chap. v.,) εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης.

tions in a page, and some chapters, like the Epistle to the Hebrews, present a continued succession of them. Clement, like the apostle Paul, paraphrases the passages he quotes, to make the purpose for which he adduces them more intelligible.

But, after all, the question for us does not lie here, and we must set aside for the moment this apostolic trait to examine only the following inquiry:—What conclusion is to be drawn from this epistle as to the canonicity of those portions of the New Testament which were already in circulation at the time of its appearance in the year 68? For we must not forget that at this period the canon had been forming for nineteen years, and was forming for thirty years more, till the year 98, when the Apocalypse appeared. The first epistle written by Paul had appeared about the year 49; Nero, fifteen years after, had burnt Rome, and put the Christians to death. He was not killed till June 9th, in 68, after having beheaded the apostle Paul; and, two years later, Jerusalem was burnt by Titus, 5th August, 70. But we know the epistle of Clement preceded that catastrophe.

It is proper, then, that we should consider more closely the testimony given by this epistle to the Holy Scriptures already published in the year 70.

261. (1.) And, first of all, we see at this period the canon so received in the churches of Greece and Italy, that the first pastor of the great city of Rome, writing in the name of his church "to the very important and very ancient church of Corinth, (*τῇ βεβαιοτάτῃ καὶ ἀρχαίᾳ,*)" reminds it with authority of the first of the epistles it had received from St Paul fifteen years before, (chap, xlvii.)

(2.) In the second place, it must be carefully observed that, when Clement quotes it, it is not as an ordinary letter; it is, as he says himself, as a scripture "truly inspired, (*ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν.*)"

(3.) This first testimony of Clement, if it were the only one, would be evidence that already at that period the church of Corinth acknowledged Paul's epistles as divine. We could say, as Peter had done, (2 Pet. iii. 15,) that this church acknowledged *all the epistles* (*ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς*) *which Paul had written, according to the wisdom given unto him;* for no reason

exists for giving this First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians any superiority over the rest, and it is very clear that Clement named that specifically to them because it treated of other dissensions which had agitated them fifteen years before; and if he named the first rather than the second, it was because the latter said not a word about them. Let it be recollected that we have seen Polycarp writing to the Philippians, and naming none of all Paul's epistles excepting his Epistle to the Philippians.

(4.) No one can question that Clement, bishop of Rome, writing from Rome in the name of the church of Rome, knew the Epistle of Paul to the Romans quite as well as the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Besides, without naming it, Clement makes frequent allusions to it, (as may be seen in our analysis,) particularly in the thirty-second, thirty-fifth, and forty-seventh chapters. Thus, also, without naming the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he manifestly quotes it several times, on other occasions and on other subjects. We have indicated above a good many of these reminiscences; they are very clearly pointed out. Especially we may refer to his beautiful chapter (the thirty-ninth) on charity.

(5.) We hear in the same manner in this epistle numerous citations of the words of Jesus Christ, taken from Matthew and Luke, without the author's being at the pains to indicate which of the evangelists supplied him with them. Such was the usage of the times.

(6.) We find, also, allusions, sufficiently marked, to many of Paul's other epistles, and to the two epistles of Peter, and we hear him reproducing passages from them which must have been easily recognised by contemporary churches.

(7.) But still more remarkable are his numerous and clear quotations from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nor is he at the pains to tell us from what source he has drawn them; but he reproduces almost entirely (in chap. xxxvi.) the thirteen first verses on the divinity of Jesus Christ. He cites, like the apostle, the examples of Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Rahab, and those who "announced the coming of Christ, *clothed in sheep-skins and goat-skins.*" In a word, the passages borrowed from this epistle occur at least fifteen or sixteen times in his text, and his citations are so exact that no one can attempt to dispute the source. It would be useless to repeat them here.

262. (8.) It is quite in vain to object, as some persons have attempted, to the frequently paraphrastic language of Clement, as if his citations from Paul, and Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Gospels were too little characteristic to authorise our proof in favour of the canon. It must be rather said, that this very liberty, with which at every turn he embodies in his discourse the sentences of the New Testament, attests with what fulness the contents of the sacred books occupied contemporary minds, so that a minister was certain, by suitably quoting a few words, to awaken in all pious persons their recollections of the written word. This mode of proceeding is, then, on the contrary, a proof to us of the existence of the canon, and the powerful effects of the anagnosis or public reading of the Scriptures. If, in the present day, I introduced into a religious discourse some expressions borrowed from chapters of the Bible best known in all ages—if I spoke of Him who "gives us our daily bread;" of "the mighty and jealous God, who visits the iniquity of the fathers on the children;" of the Saviour "wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities"—I should abstain from mentioning the book from which I took these expressions as mere pedantry.

But we have also more general inferences to deduce from the united testimony of all these apostolic fathers.

Section Seventh.

INFERENCE FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

263. We have heard all these fathers. They have come in their turn to confirm our canon, each in his own style; and their testimony for the confirmation of our faith has always been found to be in harmony with the circumstances of the age. We might not be able to construct on the language of each of them the entire doctrine of the canon, and the proof of this, in its fulness, must be sought for elsewhere. But we can irresistibly infer that these documents evidently attest the existence of the first canon—that they call to mind the greater part of our sacred books—that they proclaim their inspiration—that they demonstrate the submission that was paid to them in all the churches of God.

Still another monument, very similar to that of Clement in form and date, remains to be consulted. It differs only on one point—that it is inspired. We refer to the testimonies rendered to the canon, while in process of formation, by the apostles themselves, in some of their more recent writings.

CHAPTER XI.

THE LATER WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ATTEST THE EXISTENCE OF A CANON ALREADY BEGUN.

264. In the same manner as Clement cited, in 68, either our Lord's discourses, as reported in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, or Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, or the words of several other epistles of this apostle, and the Epistle of Peter; so Paul himself, in his first Epistle to Timothy, (v. 18,) appears to cite, but without naming it, and after the manner of the fathers, the Gospel of St Luke, when he repeats this sentence, which is only found in that evangelist, (x. 7,) "the workman is worthy of his hire."

Thus, also, the same apostle appears to us to have clearly pointed to the earlier writings of the New Testament by the name of "prophetic scriptures," (*γραφῶν προφητικῶν,*) (that is to say, according to his style, *inspired scriptures,*) when he spoke in his Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 25, 26) of the writings by which "*the mystery of Jesus Christ was then* (*νῦν*) *made known to all nations.*" In fact, one-tenth, at least, of the books of the canon were already in existence,—two Gospels, two Epistles to the Thessalonians, two to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Galatians, probably, also, the Epistle to Titus, besides the first to Timothy, and the first of Peter; and it was probably while thinking of these scriptures, already spread through all the churches, that Paul, on the point of visiting Jerusalem for the last time, wrote to the Romans, that "*the gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, was now made manifest, and by the prophetic scriptures, according to the commandment of the everlasting God; and that it was made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.*"

It has been attempted to dispute the meaning of the words "*prophetic scriptures*," as if we must recognise in them a reference to the Old Testament only. But, not to say that this would be giving a very frigid and improbable sense to the phrase, Paul here declares that it was by these scriptures that the mystery of Jesus Christ was *now* (*νῦν*) *made known to all nations;* and he has elsewhere often stated that the apostles were *prophets*, and their writings (consequently) *prophetic writings*. We think, then, the sense we have given to the words is the most natural and most conformable to the style of the apostle.

265. Moreover, no one will dispute the meaning of Peter's words in his epistle, much later than that of Paul to the Romans, which he wrote after Jesus Christ had "shewed him" that the time of his departure was at hand, (2 Pet. i. 14.) He there recommends all the epistles of Paul, (iii. 15,) and declares that the "*unlearned and unstable wrest them, as they do also* THE OTHER SCRIPTURES, *to their own destruction.*"

We see, then, already, about the year 64, or at the latest about the year 68, thirty or thirty-four years only after our Lord's crucifixion, all the epistles of Paul placed by an apostle in the rank of *the other scriptures*, (*τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς* !)

This phrase, THE SCRIPTURES, occurs fifty times in the New Testament, and fifty times it is applied exclusively to the books of the two Testaments. Thus, then, the canon was already proclaimed by an apostle, and solemnly recommended to believers of the first century; we see it mentioned as a book already occupying the same place as the Old Testament.

And we wish it to be noted, that the argument does not here depend on the inspiration of this epistle of Peter; if we only take it up as one of the witnesses left to us of the first century, its testimony assures us at once of the existence of a canon among the Christians of those ancient times, and of the assimilation made by them of the inspired scriptures of the prophets of the New Testament to the inspired scriptures of the prophets of the Old.

266. But this is not all. This Second Epistle of Peter is itself directly and verbally cited in another epistle still later, that of the apostle Jude.

Read attentively the seventeenth verse—"*But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" And what did they say, these apostles of Jesus Christ? "How that they told you," continues Jude, "that there should be mockers (*ἐμπαῖκται*) at the last time, (*ἐσχατῳ,*) who should walk (*πορευόμενοι,*) after their own ungodly lusts, (*κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.*)" And where do we find one of *the apostles of our Lord* uttering these words? We find them only in the Second Epistle of Peter; but we find them there to the very letter. There are the same expressions, "*according to their own lusts,*" (*κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθομίας αὐτῶν,* 2 Pet. iii. 3,) "*walking,*" (*πορευόμενοι,*) and, above all, the remarkable term, *scoffers,* or *mockers,* (*ἐμπαῖκται,*) which is not to be met with in any other part of the New Testament.

"*Knowing this first,*" said Peter, "*that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts,*" (iii. 3.)

But this Epistle of Jude was declared to be inspired from the second century—in the East, by Clement of Alexandria; in the West, by Tertullian, the most ancient of the Latin fathers; in the third century, by Origen, and by the majority of the ancient fathers mentioned by Eusebius. And it will be recollected that we have found it equally in each of the eleven catalogues of the New Testament transmitted to us by the fourth century, (Propp., 56, 57.)

Thus, then, the epistle of the apostle Jude, already acknowledged in the second century, cites the Second Epistle of Peter as a scripture, of which the Church ought reverently to recall the words, ("*remember,*") and as a scripture *of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.* And we have just seen that, in its turn, this Second Epistle of Peter, before the year 64, named all the epistles of Paul as occupying the same ranks as the *other* scriptures, (*τὰς, λοιπὰς γραφὰς.*)

267. We believe that we have now said enough to establish fully, by the light of history, the incomparable authenticity of the twenty books which form the first canon of the New Testament, and about which the churches never felt the least hesitation. We pass on to the seven others, and begin with the second-first canon.

BOOK III.

THE SECOND-FIRST CANON.

---

268. THE greater part of the proofs which, in the foregoing pages, have established on so powerful an assemblage of facts the authenticity of the twenty-first *homologoumena*, argue equally in favour of the twenty-first and the twenty-second, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse.

Above all, these two books have in their favour that great proof which surpasses all others,—the wonderful unanimity of all the churches during the two first centuries, setting out from the days of the apostles. We cannot cite from the literary history of all ages, as we have said, a single example of a legitimacy so powerfully demonstrated, or even one which makes a distant approach to it.

Having been admitted without opposition, from their first appearance, both in the East and West, they have a right, on this ground, to take their place in the first canon. But we have thought it more convenient not to class them with either the first or the second, and to reserve them a place apart; because, though they never ceased to be received, the one in the East, and the other in the West, yet, since the beginning of the third century, they were disputed for rather a long time, the one in the West, the other in the East.

But we must treat them with more exactness, and begin with the Apocalypse.

CHAPTER I.

THE APOCALYPSE.

SECTION FIRST.

ITS FIRST RECEPTION.

269. OF all the writings of the New Testament, the Apocalypse is found to be the most frequently and most powerfully attested in the monuments of the primitive Church. None of them has been commented upon and cited more frequently, from its first appearance. And it was not without irrefragable reasons that Eusebius ranked it among the *homologoumena*, while yet making exceptions, and allowing his mind to entertain the strong repugnance which existed in his age to the millenarian doctrine.

270. In fact, if, as Olshausen[1] has said, and Kirchhofer[2] has repeated after him, there can hardly be found in the New Testament a book which has in its favour a more numerous and powerful array of historical testimonies; yet the Apocalypse is, notwithstanding, the book against which, in later times, on account of its mysteries and prophecies, the opponents of the canon and of inspiration are most passionately adverse. In the third and fourth centuries, its misunderstood doctrine of a millennium roused opposition to it; but the principal cause in our day, especially in Germany, has been its incontestable claims to the most absolute inspiration. This wholly prophetic, that is to say, wholly inspired

[1] Authenticity of the New Testament, ch. x.

[2] "Scarcely any book of the New Testament," says Kirchhofer, (Quellensamml., p. 296,) "has such a striking abundance of historical testimonies on its behalf."

writing, can never cease to be rejected by the enemies of the Divine inspiration of the New Testament.

271. But it will be necessary, before proceeding further, carefully to notice the nature of the objections which its first detractors raised in the third and fourth centuries. When, after having been so long received by the universality of churches, the Apocalypse began, in the third century, to find some timid cavillers, and later, in the fourth, when its adversaries became more decided and numerous, none of them ever dreamt of attacking it by historical arguments; for on that side it was as perfectly impregnable as the four Gospels. Exceptions were taken to its contents; to its style, which, it was pretended, was not that of John; and to its title, where the author, it was said, while assuming the name of John, did not give himself the title of apostle; and yet the true St John, in his Gospel,[1] and in his First Epistle, (ii. 2,) had, with sufficient clearness, revealed himself as an apostle. Who, then, can assure us that the John of the Apocalypse was indeed the son of Zebedee, and not some unknown writer of the same name? Such, in the third century, were the only objections of opponents. And when Eusebius, in his turn, in 324, expressed his own, he alleged, Michaelis tells us, "no historic motive whatever. He did not say this book was not received by the ancients; it has been rejected from the time when it first appeared; it was introduced at such or such a time; no one spoke of it during John's lifetime; it was not preserved among the seven churches of Asia." By no means; none of these objections was then possible; and no one thought of advancing them, in spite of all the intense feeling with which many strove to get rid of millenarian doctrines. Certainly this consideration forms an historic argument of the greatest force in favour of its authenticity.

272. Moreover, when Eusebius sought in the Christian Church for writers who were decided against the Apocalypse, he could not find any, setting out from the days of the apostles, till the third century. There was first of all Caius, a presbyter of Rome, whose testimony has nothing decided in it; and there is Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, and who even acknowledged the canonicity and the inspiration of the book, but only called in question its apostolicity;

[1] John xxi. 24, xix. 25, 26, and elsewhere.

and certain persons in Egypt, who pretended to attribute it to Cerinthus the heretic, as had been done (out of the Church) by the heretical sect of the *Alogi*, who, from their antipathy to the name of *Logos*, (the Word,) given to Jesus Christ, rejected the Gospel of John as well as his Apocalypse.

But a long time before these first isolated voices had made themselves heard, the unanimous testimony of the churches during the whole course of the preceding century had continued to be uttered in favour of this book in all the countries of the East and West; a great number of eminent writers had never ceased to recommend it to the regard of the churches by commentaries and innumerable quotations; Justin Martyr in Asia; the church of Lyons in Gaul; Irenæus the martyr, in the same city, to which he came after he had long sojourned in Asia, in the country of Ephesus, from which the Apocalypse was issued; Theophilus in Antioch of Syria; Apollonius in Italy, where he suffered martyrdom; Melito in Asia Minor; Clement of Alexandria, in Egypt; and Tertullian in Africa.

And later still, even after the opposition of Caius and Dionysius had reached Egypt, what effect did they produce on their age? A very slight effect certainly; for the great voice of the churches continued at the same time its testimony by the mouth of the teachers and martyrs—Hippolytus of Aden, astronomer, theologian, and martyr, in Italy; the great Origen in Asia; Cyprian in Africa; Victorinus at Pettaw, in Pannonia; Methodius, bishop of Tyre, also a martyr; Arnobius of Numidia; Lactantius in Gaul, that eloquent African, who was the tutor of the son of the Emperor Constantine. And not only was the Apocalypse recommended by all who were most eminent in the Church, but even schismatics, the Novatians and Donatists, expressed the same regard for it as the orthodox theologians.

And still later, in the East, at the beginning of the fourth century, at the very time when Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory of Nazianzus, appeared unwilling to put the Apocalypse, without hesitation, in the canon of the *homologoumena*, the great Athanasius felt no scruples; and in other parts of the East might be heard Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria among the Greeks; St Ephrem among the Syrians; and in the West and in

Africa, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustin among the Latins, speaking of this book with the same reverence.

But before we pass under review these various testimonies, and notice also the Council of Laodicea, it will be convenient to fix the date of the first appearance of the Apocalypse.

SECTION SECOND.

THE DATE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

273. The exact age of the Apocalypse has been given us by Irenæus, the most reliable of witnesses, since of all those we have named none lived nearer the time nor nearer the place where the prophet wrote his revelations, and finished his career.[1]

Irenæus, the friend and disciple of Polycarp and Papias, themselves friends or disciples of John, was born in the early part of the second century, in the neighbourhood of Ephesus or Smyrna, that is to say, in that province of *the seven churches of Asia* where John, Polycarp says,[2] was burned. His birth must have been only a few years after the death of the apostle, who, according to Eusebius, lived to the days of Trajan, and, according to Jerome,[3] to the sixty-eighth year after our Lord's death, that is to say, the year 102, or the fith year of the reign of Trajan.

The following are the exact words of Irenæus:[4]—"Nor was the Apocalypse seen long ago, (*οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη,*) but almost within our generation, towards the end of the reign of Domitian, (*ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.*)"

This explicit statement receives confirmation from independent witnesses in the same century.

Clement of Alexandria[5] attests that John returned from Patmos to Ephesus *after the death of the tyrant,* (*τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος.*) Tertullian[6] speaks of Domitian as having "banished the Christians;" and of John as having "been plunged into

[1] Grabe, Prolog. in Irenæum. [2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., v., 24, iii., 25.

[3] In his work, De Viris Illustribus. See Lardner, vol. x., p. 100.

[4] Iren., Adv. Haeres., v., 30; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 18. In chap. xxviii., the same Irenæus attributes the Apocalypse to the apostle John. See also four chapters further on, sec. iv., 50.

[5] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 23. [6] Apologeticus, v.

boiling oil, without injury, and banished to an island."[1] Origen, about the year 230, tells us, in his commentary on Matthew, "that a Roman emperor, *as tradition teaches*, (ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει,) banished John to the isle of Patmos; and that John bore witness to the fact without naming the emperor." Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw, and martyr in 290, asserts repeatedly that John was banished to Patmos "by Domitian." Lastly, Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii., 18) repeats the same account at the beginning of the fourth century; likewise the treatise *De Duodecim Apostolis*, (attributed to Hippolytus,) and the apocryphal narrative of Prochorus in the third century; so also Jerome in the fourth, and Orosius in the fifth, Arethus and Primasius in the sixth, and Isidore of Seville in the seventh century.

All Christian antiquity attests that John died full of years in the province of Asia.

Epiphanius alone, about the end of the fourth century, has advanced (if we are to believe his text as it stands) the absurd account that John prophesied in Patmos during the reign of Claudius. But we have reason to suspect here an error of the copyist, since, otherwise, Lardner says, the same Epiphanius makes John more than 90 years old when he returned to Patmos. Can it be imagined that he was of such an age in the year 54, when the Emperor Claudius died, since that would make him 70 when he was first called, and 139 on the day of his death? The fathers agree in placing the latter event in the year 103.

274. Many writers in Germany and America,[2] attached to certain systems of prophetic interpretation, have made great efforts to get rid of all these historical testimonies, and to fix the publication of the Apocalypse fifty years earlier, in the days of Nero. With this view they have argued—

(1.) That the apostolic epistles were written after the Apocalypse.

(2.) That the Neronic persecution of the Christians, after the

[1] De Praesc. Haeret., 36. "Posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur."

[2] Dr Tilloch, Moses Stuart, Burgh, Professor Lee, Professor Lücke, and Guericke. The learned Lardner had before victoriously refuted the arguments by which Sir Isaac Newton had wished, in favour of his interpretations, to establish the Neronian date.

burning of Rome, extended to Asia, which no historian has ever asserted.

(3.) That the punishment of banishing to the islands was employed already, as in the time of Domitian, a supposition equally gratuitous.

(4.) That the city of Laodicea, where the seventh of the churches to which Jesus Christ addressed His apostolic epistles existed, and which was overthrown in 61, with Colossae and Hierapolis, by an earthquake, had been almost immediately rebuilt under the reign of Nero; while it appears, according to history, that almost half a century elapsed before the restoration of these cities.

(5.) That the passage in Irenæus on the date of the Apocalypse is either misunderstood, or mistranslated, or erroneous.

(6.) That all the other writers who report the same fact have copied this father, though the details of their respective testimonies attest their independence.

(7.) That the alleged passage from Origen expresses some doubt on his part as to which of the Roman emperors banished the apostle to Patmos, though the only object of Origen in this passage was to point out the moderation of John, in speaking of the persecution without naming the persecutor.

(8.) Lastly, (and this last attempt is made by Guericke,) that the perplexing passage in Irenæus indicates the Emperor Nero rather than Domitian, as the persecutor of John, because the word *Δομετιανοῦ*, instead of being the genitive of the proper name *Domitianus*, may be simply the genitive feminine of an adjective qualifying the word *ἀρχῆς* which follows it, and formed, from Domitius, one of the proper names of Domitius Nero; so that, instead of translating the clause, "*towards the end of the reign of Domitianus*," it must be read, "*towards the end of the Domitian or Neronian reign.*" And for this two reasons are given:—First, because if the word *Δομετιανοῦ* had been a proper name, it would have been preceded by the article *τοῦ*; and next, because the adjective formed from *Δομετιανός* would rather have been *Δομετιανίκος*. But these suppositions are without validity; for (1.) The Greeks never suspected this extraordinary sense; (2.) The employment of the name *Domitius*, by itself, to designate Nero, was not in use; (3.) So far from the article *τοῦ* being neces-

sary in this passage before *Δομετιανοῦ*, we shall find in the same chapter of Eusebius from which it is taken as many as three other proper names without the article;[1] (4.) Because, even supposing *Δομετιανοῦ* to be taken as an adjective, it is against all reason to derive it from *Domitius*, rather than from *Domitianus*. We have a double proof in the monuments of history, since, on the one hand, we read in Suetonius, "*Domitia gens*," and not *Domitiana*, to designate the family of Domitius Nero; and on the other, in Statius,[2] "*Viam Domitianam miratus sum*," and not *Domitianicam*, to designate a Roman road constructed by Domitian.[3]

The Apocalypse, then, did not appear till after the year 96, in which Domitian died, on the 18th of September, and when John was able at last, like many others, to come forth from his captivity.

Section Third.

THE APOCALYPSE IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

275. As the Apocalypse could not appear sooner than in the three last years of the first century, we shall not be able to find testimonies to it earlier than the beginning of the second.

Consequently, we can understand that it could not be noticed in the epistle of Clement, which was written thirty years before the Apocalypse, (Prop. 255,) nor be contained in the Peshito version, also published before this sacred book, and during one of the thirty-five last years of the first century, (Prop. 32.)

The Peshito was composed for the use of the numerous Christians of Jerusalem, Judea, Syria, Chaldea, and Adiabene, who spoke the same language as Jesus Christ, and who for a long time formed the majority of the primitive Church, since in the city of Jerusalem alone they amounted, about the middle of the first

[1] Middleton, in his excellent work on "The Use of the Definite Article in the New Testament," has established, that the rule of the double article among the Greeks does not apply to proper names.

[2] Sylvae, lib. iv., and the third ode, entitled, *Via Domitiana*.

[3] More than this, Cicero might be cited, (*pro Fonteio,*) who calls a road opened by the Proconsul Domitius, *Via Domitia*. Cæsar, it is true, (B. C., i., 16, 22,) calls the partisans of Domitius, *Domitiani*, but this termination is the Latin form applied to men of a party. It is thus that Servius calls the orations in which Cicero is lavish in the praises of Cæsar, *Cæsarianae Orationes*.

century, (in 54,) to many myriads, (Acts xxi. 20,) and according to the testimonies of history, they abounded at a very early period in the countries we have just named. This version, which contains, besides the twenty books of the first canon, the Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Hebrews, both necessarily written before the year 64, could not contain the Apocalypse, which was not composed till long after. But the Syrian church, which extended its vigorous branches to the farthest bounds of the East, very soon received it, either by placing it at the end of the ancient version, or adopting it in some more recent version. We have the proof of this (1.) From the fact that the Apocalypse was received and commented upon by the most eminent of the Syriac teachers, the illustrious St Ephrem, born at Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, about the year 320; and (2.) By this other fact, that the Nestorian branch carried the Apocalypse to China. We know, indeed, that the ancient monument discovered in 1629 by the Jesuit missionaries at Sanxuen, in the province of Xensi, and going back to the year 781, presented two inscriptions, one in Chinese, and the other in Syriac, in which the New Testament was mentioned as containing twenty-seven books, "which attests sufficiently," says Michaelis, "that the Apocalypse made a part of it." [1]

Dr Thiersch [2] is convinced of it after the researches of Hug.[3]

Section Fourth.

TESTIMONIES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

276. The very few works of this period that have reached us bear testimony to the Apocalypse.

Whoever might be the unknown author of the allegorical book called *The Shepherd*, which appeared about the middle of the second

[1] Michaelis, vol. vi., ch. xxxiii., p. 495, edit. Marsh. See Hug's Einleitung, p. 65, (ed. 1808.)

[2] Versuch zur Herstellung des Hist. Standpuncts, ch. vi. And Kirchhofer, (p. 16,) speaking of what the Peshito contained, says, "and (according to Hug's judgment) the Apocalypse."

[3] Hug's opinion is founded on the passages of Ephrem reported below, (Prop. 286.) Yet Zozomen (H. E., iii., 16) and Theodoret (H. E., iv., 29) say that Ephrem did not know Greek; and Ephrem himself, speaking of a visit he made to Basil, says that he needed an interpreter, (Ephr., Opera, iii., 712, edit. Vossii, 1603.)

century, and who is believed to have been a brother[1] of Pius I., his work presents such manifest allusions to the Apocalypse, that it may be cited as one of the witnesses of the existence of the book among the churches. He often speaks of a "*great tribulation*," (ii. 2.,) already known to Christians as speedily coming; he calls it, as John does, "*the great tribulation*," (Apoc. vii. 14.) His great beast, the four colours of its head, the locusts issuing from its mouth; the tower which, he says, is "*the woman;*" the Church, which has crowns of palms and white vestments; "the seal, on which is the name of the Son of God," &c.;—all these traits oblige us to recognise a mind familiar with the imagery of the Apocalypse.

But we pass on to *Ignatius*. This bishop, a companion of the apostles, suffered martyrdom in the year 107, that is to say, at the most, ten years after the appearance of the Apocalypse. Can we find in his three authentic epistles any traces of the Revelation of St John? It can scarcely be expected in epistles where he does not cite the books of the New Testament, except by allusions, and expressly names only the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians; for he wrote them in the company of the rough soldiers who hurried his journey to Rome for his capital punishment. And yet we find more than one passage in which we may detect reminiscences of our sacred book. Thus, for example, in his Epistle to the Romans, at the end, there is this remarkable expression of the Apocalypse, (i. 9,)—ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)—which is found nowhere else under this form in the New Testament.[2]

277. As to *Polycarp*, if we have nothing left of his own writing but his Epistle to the Philippians, too short to contain any citation from the Apocalypse of John, or from his Gospel, yet we possess, as we have seen, *the account of his martyrdom*. Written by his own church at Smyrna immediately after the event, it is to us equivalent to the testimony of Polycarp himself. But it repre-

[1] Rom. xvi. 14. Hefele (Patrum Apost. Opera, pag. lxxxi.) believes he must adopt the opinion of the author of the Fragment of Muratori, (see Prop. 196,) which attributes it to the brother of Pope Pius I., from the year 142 to 147.

[2] We might bring forward other allusions, taken from the epistles of Ignatius to the Trallians and Philadelphians. But we prefer confining ourselves to the only uncontroverted epistles which are found in the Syriac collection, edited by Cureton, (Berlin, 1845.)

sents to us his body burnt "like gold and silver melted in a furnace, (*ὡς χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος ἐν καμίνῳ πυρουμένος;*)" and thus, in citing, according to all appearance, the passage in which Peter (1 Ep. i. 7) compares suffering Christians to gold tried by fire, (*διὰ πυρὸς δοκιμαζομένου,*) they substitute the beautiful expressions of the Apocalypse (i. 15) describing the feet of the Son of man—*ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένοι.* The form of the phrase, it seems, can only be explained by this reminiscence of St John.

And again, when, at the approach of the fire which they applied to the pile, Polycarp offered a prayer, he began with these words, taken also from the Apocalypse, in the prayer of the elders—*Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ,* (Apoc. xi. 17.)

278. We can also cite at this period, so strangely destitute of monuments, Papias, who was bishop of Hierapolis, not far from Smyrna, where Polycarp resided, and who was, Irenæus tells us, (v. 23,) one of John's hearers, and a friend (*ἑταῖρος*) of Polycarp. He bore testimony in writing to the doctrine of the millennium in the fourth of his five books, which have all perished.[1] But if, in the absence of these writings, we appeal to the testimonies of antiquity, we find two eminent authors who, closely examined, leave us in no doubt respecting the use this father made of the Apocalypse. The one is Eusebius, in 324, and the other Andreas, bishop of the same city in the sixth century.

Andreas, who himself composed a commentary on the Apocalypse that is still extant, and who tells us that he consulted the ancient fathers, and made copious extracts from their writings, declares expressly, although he himself was an anti-chiliast, that Papias (as well as Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus,) had given testimony to the inspiration of this book, (*περὶ τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου.*) "As to the inspiration of the Apocalypse," he says, "we think it superfluous to employ many words to shew that the blessed Gregory, the theologian Cyril, and men more ancient, besides Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, have borne testimony to the title this book has to our confidence, (*ταύτῃ προσμαρτυρούντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον.*)"[2]

279. Eusebius, in his aversion to the millennium, tried to in-

[1] See Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii. 39, who cites some fragments.

[2] Biblioth. Patr. Max., v., 589, 590.

sinuate that Irenæus and others had taken their doctrine on this subject from Papias, who was not worthy of much confidence, "because he was," he tells us, "a man of very small capacity, (*σφόδρα γάρ τοί σμικρὸς ὢν τόν νοῦν,*) who formed his system from a misconstruction of the apostolic narratives, (*τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παρεκδεξάμενον διηγήσεις,*) and from *not comprehending what they had said mystically by figures,* (*τὰ ἐν ὑποδείγμασι πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς εἰρήμενα.*)" Yet the testimony of Papias is not less of high importance, because his personal relations to John certainly prevented his attributing to this apostle a book which he had never written.

The language of Eusebius is ambiguous and embarrassed. Sometimes he seems to wish to say that, according to the expressions of Papias, John, a presbyter, rather than John the apostle, might well have written the Apocalypse, and that Papias took his doctrine from him; sometimes he seems to say that Papias would never have imagined his earthly reign of a thousand years but for misunderstanding the mystic language of the apostolic writings. But on either of these two contradictory suppositions, Papias, according to him, knew and cited the Apocalypse.

Michaelis believes, on the contrary, that we might conclude from these passages of Eusebius that Papias derived his millenarian doctrine only "from oral traditions." But Eusebius has not said so, and, to reach this conclusion, Michaelis is obliged to translate the words of Eusebius (*παρεκδεξάμενον* and *διηγήσεις*) very differently from Valesius (H. de Valois) and many others.[1]

We conclude, then, from all this, (1.) That the very positive testimony of Andreas respecting Papias has much more force than the hypothetical and contradictory insinuations of Eusebius; and (2.) That Papias, according to Eusebius himself, founded his millenarian doctrine on the Apocalypse—on the Apocalypse of the apostle John, or on the Apocalypse of the presbyter John, but always on the Apocalypse.[2]

[1] Instead of translating, "having misunderstood the apostolic narrations," he has read, "having investigated the apostolic sayings."

[2] Eusebius having cited a fragment of Papias respecting the first disciples of the Saviour, in which the name of John occurs twice, and the second time with

SECTION FIFTH.

TESTIMONIES OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SAME CENTURY.

280. If we pass from the year 150 to the following years, numerous and eminent testimonies present themselves to us in different parts of the world, and these do not content themselves with merely mentioning the Apocalypse; they comment upon it and quote it most freely.

(1.) First of all, *Justin Martyr*, the converted philosopher, born in Palestine the same year, it is said, that the Apocalypse appeared, (in 102 or 103,) who became a Christian in 133, and suffered martyrdom in 165. He wrote his Dialogue at Ephesus, and must have known better than any other person what had happened there only thirty years before. But hear his words in his Dialogue with Trypho:—"A man among us named John, one of Christ's apostles, in an Apocalypse or Revelation which he made, (*ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ*,) has prophesied that all those who believe in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem."[1]

(2.) We have next, in 177, *The Narrative of the Martyrs of Lyons*, composed by one of the Christians of that city, who had escaped the carnage, and addressed by the churches of Gaul to those of proconsular Asia. Eusebius[2] has preserved it for us; the language of the Apocalypse pervades it. We find, for example, this remarkable expression used (Apoc. xiv. 4) to describe a true disciple of Christ:—"*I follow the Lamb wherever he goeth,*" (*ἀκολουθῶν τῷ Ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ.*) And this other, so characteristic, referring to Christ, (Apoc. i. 5; iii. 14,)—"*To the*

the epithet of *presbyter*, concluded that perhaps there were two Johns, one an apostle, the other a presbyter, and that perhaps it was this last, if not the other, who wrote the Apocalypse. Two sepulchres of John, he adds, are shewn at Ephesus; and he infers from that that one might be the apostle's, and the other the presbyter's. Eusebius would have little credit for sagacity if all his conclusions were of no more worth than this. The same Eusebius (iii., 23) has strongly affirmed, "on the testimony," he says, "of men most worthy of credit, Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria," that the apostle St John lived to the reign of Trajan, having returned from Patmos to Ephesus after the death of the tyrant, (Domitian.)

[1] See also Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iv. 18. [2] Hist. Eccl., v., 1.

faithful and true witness, and the first-born of the dead, (*τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀληθινῷ μάρτυρι, καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ τῶν νεκρῶν.*)" And again, (Apoc. xxii. 11,) speaking of the rage of these persecutors resembling *the beast,* (*θηρίου,*) *that the scripture may be fulfilled.* And what scripture? Without doubt that which they soon after quote word for word,—"*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still.*"

(3.) Again, we have the celebrated Irenæus, who came shortly after the martyrs, to take charge of the church of Lyons. In his great work, *De Haeresibus,* written about the year 185, he very often and copiously refers to the Apocalypse, quoting it in at least thirty-one different passages, calling it the work of that John, the Lord's disciple, who at the Last Supper lay on His breast.[1] He comments on it frequently, and when he explains *the number of the beast,* appeals "to all the most exact, ancient copies of this holy book, (*ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγραφοῖς,*) and to the testimony of those who had seen John with their own eyes."

(4.) In the fourth place, we find at Sardis, in Asia Minor, about the year 170, *Melito,* who presided over this church when they received the letter of the churches of Gaul respecting the martyrs of Lyons. He had written himself a treatise on "The Apocalypse of St John."[2]

(5.) We have spoken of the fragment of the Latin canon of Muratori, which is allowed to be very ancient, (Propp. 193–198.) We find in it these remarkable words:—"We also receive the Apocalypse of John, which some of our people will not have read in the church. And John, in the Apocalypse, though he writes to the churches, yet says to all, (*Apocalypsin etiam Johannes recipemus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt. Et Johannes in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat tamen omnibus dicit.*)" . . . .

It is important, in passing, to remark, in the last words of this

[1] De Haer., iv., 37, 50, v., 26, 30.

[2] Περὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iv., 26. See also Jerome, (De Vir. Illustr., ch. xxiv.) Melito presented, in 172, to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, an "Apology for the Christian Religion."

catalogue, a usage which explains and confirms what we have said (Prop. 90) of the later decree of the Council of Laodicea. The Apocalypse was universally received as Divine; but "many, at the same time, on account of its obscurity, did not wish it to be read in the public assemblies, (*quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt.*)"

(6.) We find in Syria, at the same period, *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch, who, in combating the error of Hermogenes, quotes against him the Apocalypse. This was in 181.[1]

(7.) At Rome, in 186, Apollonius, called "the eloquent," and who is believed to be the same person whose affecting martyrdom Eusebius has narrated in his Ecclesiastical History, (v. 21.) He mentions his having appealed to testimonies taken from the Apocalypse of John.[2]

(8.) Lastly, at the same time, we find in Africa two of the most respectable witnesses that Christian antiquity can produce. One of them, who will be the eighth, is *Clement of Alexandria*, about the year 191. He cites the Apocalypse very frequently.

(9.) The other, at Carthage, is the great *Tertullian*, the most ancient of the Latin fathers, as he is, also, one of the most enlightened. We can count more than seventy passages in which Tertullian cites the Apocalypse. He asserts that it is the work of the Apostle John. He defends it against the heretic Marcion, (iv. 5.,) who rejected it only for doctrinal reasons; and he appeals, on this point, (which is important,) to the testimony of the churches of Asia, and to the succession of bishops, going *back to John, the author of that book.* ("*Habemus et Johannis alumnas ecclesias; nam etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Johannem stabit auctorem.*")

All these great teachers continually cite the Apocalypse without mentioning the least opposition raised against it, up to their time, in the churches of God. Thus, to the end of the second century, and even to the beginning of the third, this holy book was universally regarded as the inspired work of the apostle John, whether in the Greek Church or the Latin—in Egypt, in Pales-

[1] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iv., 24.

[2] Κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου Ἀποκαλύψεως.

tine, in Asia Minor, in Syria, in Italy, in Africa, and even in Gaul.[1]

Section Sixth.

THE FIRST HALF OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

281. We must come down towards the middle of the third century to hear of the first serious opposition. It was not till then that some isolated depreciators of the Apocalypse began to be heard in the Church, and yet they alleged no historical reason against it. Eusebius, with all his prejudices, could only find, at the beginning of the century, one voice (the first) at Rome, that of a presbyter named Caius, who, in a controversy with Prochus, in order to repel his gross errors on the millennium, had set himself against this book by attributing it to Cerinthus.[2] But even his attacks (see Eusebius) have not been clearly ascertained.[3] Hug questions them.[4] This Caius was animated by a strong antipathy against the millenarian doctrine, of which he had conceived a revolting idea from the totally carnal descriptions of it by Cerinthus, the Gnostic, who, it is said, was opposed by St John. But Caius, in the words cited by Eusebius, (iii. 28,) did not say, as was asserted, that Cerinthus ascribed his gross notions to the Apocalypse. He traced them "to certain revelations, (δι' ἀποκαλύψεων,)" which, he asserted, "were written by a great apostle," and "to wonders which, he pretended, had been shewn him by angels."[5] Further, the martyr Hippolytus has victoriously refuted, in several chapters of his writings, the errors of Caius; and, whatever may have been the words of the latter in Rome, words which remain unknown, they certainly made a very slight impression there, since Rome, as well as the churches of the West, has never ceased to acknowledge this scripture as an inspired book.

It would appear, also, from some words of Dionysius of Alex-

[1] We do not speak of heretics. Out of the Church, the impious sect of the Alogi, enemies of the term *Logos* applied to Jesus Christ, rejected at the same time the Gospel of John and his Apocalypse. [2] Hist. Eccl., iii. 28, vii., 25.

[3] Michaelis, (French translation,) iv., pp. 528–548.

[4] See his Introduction.

[5] Δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τεραλογίας ἡμῖν ὡς ὑπ' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδομένος.

andria,[1] cited by Eusebius, (vii. 25,) that in Egypt, about a quarter of a century after Caius, some anonymous persons, before the days of Dionysius, (the Alogi,) had rejected the Apocalypse, and had gone to the absurd hardihood of attributing it to Cerinthus. Absurd, we say, because there is not a sacred book more contrary to the peculiar doctrines of Cerinthus than the Apocalypse, as Lardner has proved.[2]

282. Lastly, Eusebius shews us, again in Egypt, forty years after Caius, towards the middle of the third century, the first man of any note who raised his voice, not against the canonicity or Divine inspiration of the Apocalypse, (for he acknowledged both,) but only against its apostolicity. This was Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria from the year 247, who died in 264; a man of learning, and justly respected, but of whose numerous writings we know scarcely anything except by the fragments preserved in the history of Eusebius.[3] Yet it is somewhat remarkable that Dionysius, to justify his prejudices against the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, has not been able, as we have just intimated, to allege a single historical argument, and is obliged to content himself with saying, "that some before him had rejected it, attributing it to Cerinthus." And, certainly, that so learned a man should find it impossible to advance any historic objection, is a fact which Michaelis[4] impartially declares to be of "very great weight."

We will now state what are almost the only reasons alleged by Dionysius to prove that the Apocalypse, instead of being St John's, was the work of some other disciple equally inspired, and bearing the same name; for example, of John Mark, (the cousin of Barnabas,) or, rather, of another John, who lived in the province of Asia; for he said that two sepulchres were still shewn near Ephesus, both distinguished by the name of John.

In the first place, the author of the Apocalypse calls himself John more than once; while the apostle has never named himself either in the epistles or in his Gospel. In the second place, while

[1] Τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν, says Dionysius.
[2] Vol. ii., (in 4to,) p. 700.
[3] VII., 20, 22, 25, 26, vi., 45, 46, (above all, vii., 25.)
[4] Chap. xxxii., vol. ii.; vi., p. 484.

calling himself John, he never says apostle. Then there is no mention of the epistles of John in the Apocalypse, nor of the Apocalypse in the epistles. In the fourth place, there are great resemblances between the three epistles and the Gospel of John; but none can be found between those books and the Apocalypse. Fifthly, while the Greek of those books is very correct, that of the Apocalypse is not so.

Of all these objections, the only serious one is that relating to the dissimilarity of styles.

But every one knows how very different in this respect are often the productions of the same author, according to the subjects he treats of, the period or circumstances of his writing. Who has not noticed this in the sacred authors of both Testaments, according as they narrate, or exhort, or prophesy? Let any one make the trial, and compare, for example, Moses in his history, with Moses in his last song, (Deut. xxxii.;) Isaiah in his historical chapters, (xxxvi. to xxxviii.,) with Isaiah in his poetic prophecies; St Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, with St Paul in his Epistle to Philemon.

Even Dionysius, after having laid open his prejudices against the Apocalypse, takes care to add, "*that for himself, he dare not reject it, so many brethren being strongly attached to it.*"[1] And if he hesitates to grant that John, the son of Zebedee, was its author, he by no means doubts its "*inspiration*"—"that the John, whoever he might be, who wrote the Apocalypse had a Divine revelation—that he received *from heaven* knowledge, and a prophecy, is what I *will not deny;*[2] and *I admit, with others,* that it must have been the work of some *holy and divinely-inspired man,* (*ἁγίου μὲν γὰρ εἶναί τενος καὶ θεοπνεύστου συναινῶ.*)"

Thus, then, we must not rank even Dionysius of Alexandria among the opponents of the Apocalypse. I mean, of its canonicity and its inspiration; he only impugned its apostolicity, and he did even this with a considerable measure of reserve and doubt.

[1] Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀθετῆσαι μὲν οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιμι τὸ βιβλίον, πολλῶν αὐτὸ διὰ σπουδῆς ἐχόντων ἀδελφῶν.

[2] Τουτῳ δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐωρακέναι, καὶ γνῶσιν εἰληφέναι καὶ προφητείαν, οὐκ ἀντειρω.

And if, since Dionysius, objectors have become for a time more numerous and more confident, they have never appealed, as we have said, to history; so that their prejudices ought not to have more weight with us than we grant to those of modern authors.

283. But while in this first half of the third century the first isolated expressions of doubt which Eusebius was able to quote made themselves heard with so much reserve,—while he beheld far behind him, during the same time, the long chain of witnesses, this chain, which we have seen begin in the days of the apostles, continued to extend itself with increasing reputation; and in particular, three of the most pious, and, what is of importance here, three of the most learned doctors of Christian antiquity,—all three martyrs or sons of martyrs—one in Asia, at Rome, and in Arabia, the other in Palestine, and the third at Carthage,—loudly expressed, and with copious citations, their veneration for the Apocalypse.

The first, Hippolytus, one of the most learned men of antiquity, not less celebrated in mathematics and astronomy than in sacred literature, was an intimate friend of Origen. He was a teacher at once for the East and the West; for after having been, as it is believed, bishop of Aden,[1] in Arabia, he came to the capital of the empire about the year 235, laboured there for a long time, and even is believed to have suffered martyrdom there.[2] This great man was not content with frequently citing the Apocalypse as one of the inspired works of the apostle John. He wrote a commentary upon it often cited by the ancients,[3] and devoted some chapters expressly to refute the errors of Caius. The testimony of a man so learned and so pious was of such weight, that Michaelis attributes chiefly to his influence the universal reception of the

[1] Portus Romanus. This fact, maintained by Cave, (Hist. Litt. Saeculum Novatianum,) is strongly rejected by Bunsen, (see his Hippolytus.) But the arguments of Cave remain, and we do not think that they have been satisfactorily answered.

[2] At least there was in his time a Bishop Hippolytus quartered for the kingdom of God. In 1551, near the walls of Rome, a curious marble was discovered raised to his memory, and bearing a list of his works, so highly were they esteemed. (See Bunsen's Hippolytus, vol. i., p. xxii., 13, 210, 213.)

[3] Among others, by Andreas, bishop of Caesarea, in 520, and Jacob the Syrian, bishop of Edessa, in 651. (Michaelis, p. 479.)

Apocalypse in the Christian Church. In his book on *Christ and Antichrist*, in seventy short chapters, which we still possess, he says, "John saw in the isle of Patmos terrible mysteries. Tell me, then, O John, thou apostle and disciple of Christ, what hast thou seen of Babylon?"

The second witness, still more illustrious, is Origen, in the first half of the third century. There is not, indeed, an authority of equal weight in all antiquity on a question of sacred criticism. He was born fifteen years before the end of the second century, and died in 253. "This learned man," Michaelis says, "notwithstanding his ardent opposition to the doctrine of the millenarians, received the Apocalypse into the canon of the inspired Scriptures." He had not the least doubt of its authenticity as a work of John the son of Zebedee. In his commentary on St John, he calls that apostle, on account of the Apocalypse, (*διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως*,) *apostle, evangelist, and prophet.* He mentions this book so often in his writings, that it would be superfluous to accumulate citations. "What shall we say of John, who laid his head on the bosom of Jesus," he writes in a passage preserved by Eusebius,[1] "for not only has he left us a Gospel, declaring that he could have written many more things in it, so that the world could not contain them, but he has likewise written the Apocalypse,[2] in which it was ordained for him to seal up the things uttered by the seven thunders, and not to write them?" Therefore the learned Dr Lücke, a modern opponent of the Apocalypse, has had the fairness to say, "That which is of the greatest weight against us is, that Origen has so often cited this book as being the work of the apostle John,[3]—Origen, who made so many researches relative to the canon of the New Testament, to its limits and its classifications, and who never concealed the objections raised against such or such a book."

Lastly, the third of our witnesses at this remote epoch is the learned and pious Cyprian in Roman Africa, the contemporary of Origen, and the martyr of Carthage. When he cites the Apoca-

[1] Hist. Eccl., v., 25. See other remarkable citations in Kirchhofer, 1842, p. 309.

[2] "Εγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν.

[3] "De bona patient." He cites there Apoc. xix. 10.

lypse, it is as a *work of St John*, as a *book of Holy Scripture*,[1] as a writing *inspired by God*.[2]

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE SECOND HALF OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

284. In this latter portion of the century we shall meet no new opponent of importance; on the contrary, we shall find the Apocalypse received into the canon as an apostolic writing, as fully by the teachers of the schismatic churches, the Novatians and Donatists,[3] as by the most eminent writers of the age in the universal Church;—I mean, by Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, and who wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse;[4] by Methodius, his contemporary, bishop of Tyre, and, like him, a martyr;[5] by Arnobius of Numidia, the illustrious apologist of the Christian religion, in his commentary on the 102d Psalm;[6] and, lastly, by the learned Lactantius, his disciple, to whom the Emperor Constantine intrusted the education of his son, and who died, it is said, in 325.[7]

285. Thus, then, from the first appearance of the Apocalypse, the long chain of testimonies rendered by the most brilliant lights of the Church to its authenticity, inspiration, and apostolicity, was continued. These testimonies were brilliant in the east, and not less brilliant in the west; they were proclaimed in the north as far as Pannonia and Gaul, and to the south, in Italy, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, Arabia, and Proconsular Africa; and if, at the same time, some isolated voices less approving, hesitating, or contrary were heard, not on the inspiration of the book, but on the person of its author, even these voices must add new weight to our argument, since they attest the absolute inability of its adversaries to cite any historic proof in support of their opposition.

[1] "De Eleemos." He cites Apoc. iii. 17, 18. "Audi in Apocalypsi Domini tui vocem," &c.

[2] He cites also Apoc. xvii. 15. "In Apocalypsi Scriptura Sacra declarat dicens. . . ." [3] Lardner, iii., 121, 565. Edit. in 4to. [4] Ibid., p. 163.

[5] Ibid., pp. 181, 198.

[6] Ibid., p. 480. If the commentaries on the Psalms are not the work of Arnobius the younger. (Cave, Hist. Litt., i., p. 161.)

[7] Instit., vii., 17; Epitome, cap. xlii., 73, 74.

Section Eighth.

WITNESSES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

286. The voices of this fourth century, notwithstanding the hesitation of Eusebius and the silence of Cyril, Gregory, and Chrysostom, were very distinct, and prepared for the unanimous readoption of the Apocalypse in all parts of the universal Church.

Among the Latins all the great theologians of the age bore testimony to it—St Ambrose, at Milan; St Jerome, in Rome, and afterwards in the East;[1] St Augustin, in Proconsular Africa, where his writings no sooner appeared than they spread, it was said, like the light; Rufinus, in Venetia, in the East, and in Rome.[2]

Among the Syrians it had St Ephrem for a witness, the most eminent of all their teachers,[3] although it is not found, as we have said, in their Peshito version,[4] which was made before the death of St John. St Ephrem makes use of all the books of the New Testament, as well in his works which remain to us in Greek as in those which are in Syriac, (Opera, Syr., ii, 232.) He says, for example, "John saw in his Apocalypse a great and admirable book, guarded by seven seals." And elsewhere, (ii. p. 342,) "The day of the Lord is a thief," (Apoc. iii. 3, xvi. 45.) These Syriac churches spread through all the East, into Tartary, and even as far as China. The famous monument discovered by the Jesuits at Sanxuen,[5] bore on its two inscriptions, as we have already said, (Prop. 275.) the mention of the New Testament as containing twenty-seven books, which proves that for these churches the Apocalypse made a part of it.

287. Among the Greeks the most illustrious theologians of this

[1] "Apocalypsis Johannis," he says in his letter to Paulinus, "tot habet sacramenta quot verba." (Opp., tom. iv., p. 576.)

[2] "Johannis epistolae tres." "Apocalypsis Johannis," he says. "*Haec sunt quae Patres inter Canonem conclusserunt;* ex quibus fidei nostrae assertiones constare voluerunt."—*Expositio in Symb. Apost.*, p. 26, *apud Cyprianum.*

[3] See Michaelis, p. 495–497; Lardner, vol. iv., p. 313.

[4] Propp. 32–34, 275.

[5] And found again in 1850 by the care of the Protestant bishop of Shanghai—*North China Herald. The Record*, March 31, 1851.

century received the Apocalypse as a divinely-inspired writing. Among others, Athanasius, who often cites it, and who, in his "Festal Epistle," gives us actually the same catalogue of the writings of the New Testament which all the churches of Christendom offer at the present day, (Propp. 65, 66;) Epiphanius, (Propp. 68, 69;) St Basil the Great, who cites it in his second book against Eunomius,[1] and who is named by Arethas as acknowledging its inspiration; St Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria. Therefore we see that Eusebius has not dared, in his chapter on the canon, (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 25,) to leave it out of the number of the uncontroverted books; and with these is to be placed, (*τακτέον*,) he says, "the Apocalypse of John, if it should appear so, (*εἴγε φανείη*,) . . . . which some, as I have said, reject, but others reckon it among the *homologoumena*, (*ἐγκρίνουσι τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις*.)" Thus Eusebius, sometimes favourable, sometimes hesitating, yielded to the prejudices of his times against the millenarianism which was attributed to the Apocalypse; but he acknowledged very freely that the historical testimonies of the ancients were all favourable to it.

Cyril of Jerusalem appears to have hesitated, like Eusebius, on this point; for if he has not named the Apocalypse in the catalogue which we find in his fourth catechesis, (Prop. 59,) yet he cites it very clearly three times (Apoc. xii. and xvii.) in his fifteenth catechesis, (chapters 12, 13, and 27.)[2] And we believe we may say as much of Gregory of Nazianzus and of Chrysostom, for both, though they received, as it would appear, the Apocalypse, have abstained, like Calvin in modern times, from commenting upon it, and have made only some few quotations from it; so that their opinion on this book has remained a subject of controversy.

In fact, as to Gregory of Nazianzus, although in the verses of his xxxiii. poem (Propp. 60, 61) he has not, as we have said, named directly the Revelation of St John, yet in the 24th verse we have seen him mark this apostle sufficiently as the author of the Apocalypse, when he calls him *κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφοίτης*,

[1] Lardner, vol. iv., p. 279, v., 13.

[2] See Moses Stuart on the Apocalypse, vol. i., p. 361; Elliott, Horæ Apoc., p. 32, (3d edition.)

"The great herald who perambulates heaven." Moreover, in another of his writings which is extant, Lardner says that Gregory[1] clearly cites the Apocalypse twice; and Andreas of Caesarea, not only mentions him as one of the fathers who acknowledged it, but cites it himself on several occasions.[2]

And as to Chrysostom, though he scarcely ever cites the Apocalypse, we hear him, at the beginning of his commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, making an evident allusion to it when he names St John as "the blessed evangelist, who was exiled in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, (*καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐξωρίσθη ἐκεῖ,*) and who ended his days there." And Professor Lücke[3] has pointed out, after Wetstein and Schmid, many passages in the homilies of Chrysostom on Matthew, where that father evidently borrows from the Apocalypse, which seems, he says, to confirm the assertion of Suidas, that Chrysostom received the three epistles of John, and his Apocalypse, (*δέχεται δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ τὰς τρεῖς καὶ τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν,*) and this shews how very little we ought to rely on negative arguments taken from the absence or rarity of certain citations in certain authors.

288. In the same century two councils drew up, as we have mentioned, their catalogues of the Holy Scriptures, and one of them—that of Laodicea, in Phrygia, in 367—excluded the Apocalypse from the canon, while the other—that of Carthage, in 397—admitted it. But, as we have shewn in our First Book, (Chap. xii,) the authenticity of the decrees which in both cases referred to this subject has been formally called in question; and even admitting their authenticity, the intention of the fathers was not to fix authoritatively what were the inspired books of the Old and the New Testament, but only to decide, as the terms of the decree[4]

[1] The first time he says, Ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως. The second time he quotes this verse—Καὶ ὁ ὤν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ Παντοκράτωρ.

[2] In his commentary on the Apocalypse. See Lardner, v., 5. See Prop. 61, and the Note.

[3] Lücke, Einleitung, p. 337.

[4] "Quia *a Patribus* (the decree of Carthage says) ista accipimus *in Ecclesiâ* LEGENDA." "Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ (says that of Laodicea) *ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς* (*plebeios psalmos*) ΛΕΓΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλ-

sufficiently express, *what books might be usefully read in the public assemblies of the Church, and what ought not to be read.*

Thus, while in the Council of Laodicea, the divine but mysterious book of the Apocalypse was excepted from this number—as at the present day it is by our brethren of the Anglican Church in their calendar and preface to their liturgy, though esteemed by them a canonical book—on the other hand, in the Council of Carthage, it was decided to allow the public reading, not only of the inspired and properly canonical books, but also of some other books revered for their doctrine and their antiquity, which on this account were called *ecclesiastical*, and sometimes, but more rarely, *regular* or *regulative*, (that is to say, serving as a rule for manners if not for belief,) and in regard to which the practice of one church might differ from the practice of another. [1]

289. Thus, then, the Apocalypse, during the three first centuries which followed its appearance in the Church—I mean, during the second, third, and fourth centuries—was received as divine; and though Dionysius of Alexandria in the third century expressed some doubts affecting, not its canonicity, but its apostolicity; though others at a later period, in the East especially, during the times of Eusebius, and the evil times of Arianism, hesitated to accept and use it for public worship; though at the end of the

λὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ."—*Bruns, Canones Apost. et Concil.*, Berolini, 1839, p. 79, (the fifty-ninth canon of the council, or the sixty-third in the "Codex Canonum Eccl. Univ.")

[1] See on this subject our Propp. 88, 89, and Note 2, p. 76. More ample statements will be found (1.) in Cosin, "History of the Canon to the Year 419," London, 1683; and (2.) in Westcott, "General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament," Cambridge, 1855. The latter writer, after a very attentive study of the Greek manuscripts of the canon, of their Latin versions, and, above all, of the Syriac manuscripts preserved in the British Museum, as well as the systematic collections of the canons made at different times, judges, contrary to Cosin, that "on the whole it cannot be doubted that external evidence is decidedly against the authenticity of the catalogue as an integral part of the text of the Canons of Laodicea." He thinks that "the catalogue is of Eastern and not of Western origin;" and "that some early copyist endeavoured to supply, either from the writings of Cyril, or more probably from the usage of the Church which Cyril represented, the list of books which seemed to be required by the language of the last genuine canon." (Pp. 504, 505.) Professor Spittler (according to Michaelis, p. 489) had already endeavoured to shew that this part of the canon of Laodicea is an imposture, and has been marked as suspected in many editions of the Councils; for example, in Harduin, (pp. 292, 293.)

fourth century many churches of the Greeks, as St Jerome[1] has expressed it, did not receive it *with the same liberty* as their predecessors had done, and all the churches of the West still did; yet their objections had never an historical character, and were always rejected and combated by the great body of teachers. No church could be named which absolutely rejected it, and it was never attacked but the attack was censured; so that Augustin, at the end of the fourth, and at the beginning of the fifth, century, classed the rejection of the Apocalypse among the heresies, (*De Haeres.*, cap. xxx.,) as Tertullian had done in the second and third, (*Contra Marcion*, lib. iv.)

Section Ninth.

FIFTH CENTURY.

290. The fifth century at last saw an end put to the uncertainties which had followed in the fourth, the days of Eusebius, and the controversy of the anti-millenarians. At that time, when Arianism had done so much mischief to the churches, there were minds disposed to make light of the testimonies of antiquity in order to give themselves up to rash conjectures, destitute entirely of an historical basis, and having no support but doctrinal prejudices. It is to this tendency of his times that Jerome alludes when, speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, he says—(*Ep.* 119 *ad Dardan.*,)—"And yet, for ourselves, we receive both of these books, (*et tamen nos utrumque suscipimus,*) conforming, in so doing, not to the fashion of the times, but to the authority of ancient authors, (*nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes.*)" Nevertheless, starting from the first half of this century, the unanimity of the churches, which for a long time had been gained for all the books of the second canon, was finally and for ever given to the sacred book of the Apocalypse.

[1] "Nec Graecorum quidem ecclesiae Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt et tamen nos (eam) suscipimus . . . . veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes."—*Ep. ad Dardanum*, tom. ii., p. 608. Edit. Paris.

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION FIRST.

ITS CHARACTER AND HISTORY.

291. THE matter, style, order, and scope of this book are sufficient to impress upon it a peculiar character of majesty. The noble eloquence of its diction, and the calm authority and sublime simplicity of its tone, correspond to the profundity and elevation of its doctrines. We abstain, in general, from taking our arguments from internal criticism, and from seeking for them elsewhere than in the testimonies of history; but it is also from history, as the impression of all time, produced in favour of this book by the religious sublimity of its teachings. God, who had spoken by His prophets, has spoken to us at last by His own Son, the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and as much superior to the angels as the Creator to the created. We must contemplate here the eternal existence of this Son of God, and His mysterious humanity; His eternal apostleship and priesthood, His ineffable sympathy, His all-powerful intercession, and the perfect fulness of His expiation; then, also, the divine harmony of the two Testaments, the identical characteristics of the elect in all ages, the ardent aspirations of the people of God relative to Christ, the eternal safety of those who belong to Him, the dreadful ruin of those who reject Him; lastly, the cloud of witnesses who attest the efficacy, the power, and the reality of faith. Such are the sublime teachings of this epistle; and the whole ending in a final act of adoration to that God of peace, who "brought from

the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep, by the blood of the Everlasting, and who alone is able to work in us that which is acceptable in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever!"

292. Evidently written before the destruction of the temple,[1] and, according to all appearance, before the martyrdom of James, (which took place in 62,) and to whom it seems to allude,[2] this epistle, addressed, moreover, to converted Hebrews, and sent, consequently, either to Palestine, or, more particularly, to the church at Jerusalem, or to the Hebrews scattered throughout the empire,—this epistle, we say, forms rather a treatise than a letter. It must have first circulated from Jerusalem through all the Israelitish congregations in the East; and we might reasonably expect, supposing this scripture to be authentic, that, above all, the Israelitish churches of the East, the Syrian churches, and particularly the church of Jerusalem, would furnish us with the most authentic and trustworthy information respecting it. We can, also, readily grant that, if this scripture were supposititious, it would be among the Hebrews, rather than in any other part of the Christian world, that we should hear the most violent opposition to its legitimacy. An impostor would have sought for partisans, recommendations, and false testimonies, as far as possible, from the churches of Judea.

293. It is, then, precisely an historical fact, most worthy of notice, that, uninterruptedly, from the days of the apostles, the Epistle to the Hebrews has been received as Divine at Jerusalem, among the Syriac Christians, and in all the churches of the East.

294. It must, also, be equally granted, that if, as it affirms, this letter was written from Italy a very short time before the Neronian persecution, it would be immediately acknowledged by the Christians of Rome; and it is equally admitted, even by opponents, that it was fully recognised and quoted in Rome by Clement, bishop of Rome, a contemporary of Paul, the most ancient and revered of the apostolic fathers.

295. Nevertheless, the churches of the West, and, more especially, that very church of Rome, after having at first rendered to

[1] See Heb. ix. 6, 7, x. 1–3, 11.

[2] Heb. xiii. 7. Τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς.

the epistle a homage so early, and so decisive, began, towards the first half of the third century, to hear voices of opposition, on account of the Montanists and Novatianists.[1]

In consequence of this, we think it right to reserve a place apart for the Latin fathers in the review we are about to take of the testimonies of antiquity; and we shall begin with noticing on this subject the unanimity of the churches of the East. It will, perhaps, be more useful in this review to set out at first from the fourth century in the East, and to go back from that to the first, in order to redescend afterwards, in the West, to the fourth or fifth century.

SECTION SECOND.

THE TESTIMONIES OF THE EAST IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

296. And, first of all, to what person more worthy of credence can we appeal, in the fourth century, than to the patriarch of the Hebrews, Cyril of Jerusalem, one of the most learned and most pious men of his age? He was born in 315. Already famous at the age of thirty-four, he composed his *Catecheses*, one of the most ancient expositions we have of the Christian faith. He was, also, one of the most eminent leaders of the Second Oecumenical Council, held at Constantinople in 381.[2] But Cyril, (we have already seen, Prop. 59,) when he gives, at Jerusalem itself, in his fourth Catechesis, a catalogue of the divine and inspired (*αἱ θεόπνευστοι*) books of the Old and New Testaments, reckons in it, besides the seven Catholic epistles, the FOURTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL, (*τὰς Παύλου δεκατέσσαρας ἐπιστολάς,*) and he declares that "the collection of all these books was transmitted to us by the apostle and ancient bishops, the presidents of the Church, (*οἱ ἀποστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπίσκοποι, οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προστάται, οἱ ταύτας [μονας βιβλους] παραδοντες.*)"

297. And again, what other witness in the East better informed than the learned Jerome? When he went from Rome to pursue his biblical studies in Palestine, he probably brought with him the prejudices of the Latins against the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[1] No doubt because they erroneously supported their views by chap. vi. See Kirchhofer on the Canon, pp. 240, 243, 247, 425, (Quellensammlung zur Gesch. des Neutest, Can. bis auf Hierom. Zurich, 1842.) [2] See Socrates, Hist. Eccl., v., 8.

And yet he attests that he receives both it and the Apocalypse; and, moreover, he declares to the Christians of the West, in his letter to Dardanus, already quoted, (Prop. 290,) that not only it was actually received as Paul's in all the churches of the East, but that it had been so *by all the ancient writers in the Greek language*, and that it was read daily in the assemblies of the Church. "This," said he, "is what must be made known to all our churches, (that is, to the Latins,) though most of them believe it to be by Barnabas or Clement, (*epistolam quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur.*) "And it little matters whose it is," he adds, "since it is daily sanctioned by the reading of the churches, (*et nihil interesse cujus sit, quam . . . quotidiè ecclesiarum lectione celebretur.*)" "For if *the custom of the Latins* does not receive it into the number of the canonical Scriptures, (*quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas,*) yet we receive it, (*et tamen nos eam suscipimus.*) We must not follow in this the custom of these times, (among the Romans,) but rather the authority of ancient authors, (*nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes.*)"[1]

Therefore it is generally believed that it was especially the testimony of Jerome, as well as that of Augustin, which was the instrument made use of by God to bring back the Roman church from the grave error into which it had fallen for so long a time on the subject of this epistle, and to restore this sacred book to its place in the canon of that church.

298. It would be difficult to present a witness in this age among the Orientals more worthy of our confidence than *Athanasius*, both from his place in the universal Church, and from his knowledge and discernment in Christian antiquities. This father, as we have said, (Prop. 65,) united with all the churches of the East in revering the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have read in his "catalogue of the Scriptures held as canonical and received as

[1] See also his Epistle 125 to Evagrius. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," he says, "which all the Greeks receive, and some of the Latins, (*quam omnes Graeci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum.*)"

divine," (*τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία,*) these express words, "of Paul the apostle—there are fourteen epistles, (*Παύλου ἀποστόλου ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατεσσαρες.*)" He enumerates them, and puts the Epistle to the Hebrews in the tenth place, before his four pastoral epistles.

299. We can also cite equally in this age Titus of Botsra in 362, the Council of Laodicea in 367, Epiphanius in 368, Basil the Great in 370, Gregory of Nazianzus in 370, Gregory of Nyssa and St Ephrem the Syrian in 371, Diodorus of Tarsus in 378, Amphilochius of Iconium in 380, Theodorus of Mopsuestia in 394, and Chrysostom in 398. We learn from Epiphanius (*Haeres.*, 69) and from Theodoret [1] that in their time, out of the pale of the Church, this epistle, on account of the striking testimony it bore to the divinity of Jesus Christ, was rejected by certain antitrinitarian heretics. "It is not to be wondered at," (*θαυμαστὸν οὐδέν,*) says this latter father, "if men tainted with the Arian malady (*τὴν ἀρειανικὴν εἰσδεξάμενοι νόσον*) rave on the subject of the apostolic Scriptures, wishing to separate from them the Epistle to the Hebrews, and calling it illegitimate, (*νόθον*;) for if they dare to raise their voice against our God and Saviour, will they not dare to raise it against the most devoted and loud-sounding heralds of the truth? (*τῶν εἰνόων αὐτοῦ καὶ μεγαλοφώνων τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύκων.*)"

But we ascend to the third century.

Section Third.

WITNESSES OF THE EAST IN THE THIRD CENTURY.

300. Without stopping at Dionysius of Alexandria,[2] and at the Council of Antioch, who equally acknowledged the Epistle to the Hebrews as written by Paul, we cannot do better for this period than first of all to consult Eusebius, who distinguished himself already towards the end of the century, but who rather belongs to the next, and the great Origen, who begins the third century, and who, still much more learned, consecrated his powers and his life to the study of the Scriptures.

[1] Interpret. Ep. ad Heb., Proem. Opp., tom. iii., p. 541.
[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., v., 41.

In the twenty-fifth chapter of his third book, Eusebius does not hesitate to class in the canon of *uncontroverted books* all the fourteen epistles of Paul, without excepting the Epistle to the Hebrews. "The fourteen epistles of Paul," he says again, (in his third chapter,) "are evident and certain, (*πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς*;) but it will not be just to conceal the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it was disputed by the church of the Romans as not being Paul's. (*Ὅτι γε μὴν τινὲς ἠθετήκασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν.*)"

Origen, almost a hundred years before, received it so fully for Divine, that he composed homilies to expound it to the people; and the following are his words elsewhere, in a passage preserved by Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 25 ;)—"The style of the Epistle to the Hebrews has not the character of simplicity peculiar to this apostle, who calls himself a man rude of speech; but the epistle is more Hellenic in the construction of the style, (*συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικώτερα,*) as every one who can judge of the difference of style will confess. But, on the other hand, the thoughts of this epistle are admirable, (*θαυμάσια,*) and not inferior (*οὐ δεύτερα*) to the scriptures universally recognised as apostolic; and this any one will grant (*συμφῆσαι*) to be true who has devoted himself to apostolic reading. And I will declare what my opinion is," he adds; "the thoughts are those of the apostle; but the phraseology and composition are those of a person who has recalled the apostolic instructions, or who has written notes on the things said by his teacher. If, then, any church regards this epistle as Paul's, let it be held in honour for so doing, (*εὐδοκιμειτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ*;) for it is not without reason (*εἰκῇ*) that the men of old time have handed it down as Paul's. Who, then, was the writer? God knows the truth, (*τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν*;) but the report has come to us, (*ἡδε εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία,*) on the part of some, that Clement, who became bishop of the Romans, was the author; and of others, that it was Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts."

Such, then, was the state of opinion in the East respecting this holy epistle, if we may judge by Origen and Eusebius. All held it to be divine; and almost all believed it to be Paul's. This was

the opinion, they tell us, *of all the men of ancient times*. These persons had handed it down as written by Paul; but some contemporaries of Origen were led, in no degree for historical reasons, but only on account of the elegance of the style, to believe that Paul could not have been the immediate author, and that he had suggested the thoughts to one of his fellow-labourers—to Clement, for example, or to Luke. And yet Origen only gives this as a report that had reached him, on the part of some, and not as an opinion which he had adopted.

Section Fourth.

WITNESSES OF THE EAST IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

301. Having reached the second century, we can call in one of the most powerful testimonies, in the person of Clement of Alexandria, the most learned and influential man of his day, who taught with extraordinary success in the most learned city of the East. Born only forty years after the death of John, he said of himself, that "by his age he was near the apostolic times," (*Strom.*, i., 1;) so that when, like Origen, he supported his testimony by that of the ancients, these ancients could be no other than the contemporaries of the apostles themselves. He brought, very unwisely, no doubt, the pretensions and habits of his philosophy into the study of Christianity; but even this disposition, though it might injure the purity of his faith, perhaps would insure more independence in his judgment on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here we have his own words, as preserved to us by Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.*, iv., 14:)—

"The Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of Paul. He composed it himself in Hebrew, and St Luke translated it into Greek.[1] Hence the resemblance of his style to that of the Acts. And if Paul did not place at the head of his epistle either his name of Paul, or his title of apostle, it was for a good reason. He addressed himself to men who were very prejudiced against him. It was, then, a point of prudence to abstain from naming himself, in order not to deter any of them from undertaking to read it. Moreover, (and this is what the blessed presbyter said, ὁ μακάριος

[1] We shall refute the supposition in the sequel.

πρεσβύτερος,)[1] considering that our Lord, as far as He was the Apostle or Messenger of the Most High, had been especially sent to the people of the Hebrews, (ἀπεστάλη,) and the Epistle to the Hebrews is the only one in the New Testament in which he is called by that name, (Heb. iii. 1,) it was becoming that Paul should abstain from giving himself, in his epistle, the title of Apostle of the Hebrews, whether from modesty, or from reverence towards the Lord, or because he was simply himself *the apostle of the Gentiles.*"

302. This testimony of Clement of Alexandria, like that of Origen, is not only of great weight for any one who considers the character of these men of God, their learning, their travels, their proximity of time and place in reference to the epistle; but it is still more weighty, when we think of their prejudices as to the nature of its style, and its too Hellenic elegance. The historical evidence must have had irresistible force for these men to feel constrained, by the unanimous tradition of the churches of the East, to acknowledge that, notwithstanding, the epistle was Paul's.

Moreover, it has been said, that the testimony of Clement was that of the Church of Alexandria, founded by the same Mark[2] whom Peter (1 Ep. v. 13) calls his "son," and whom Paul (2 Tim. iv. 11, Col. iv. 6) sent for when he was a prisoner at Rome, because "he was profitable to him," he said, "for the ministry."[3] This testimony hence becomes, as it were, the combined deposition of Mark, Peter, and Paul.

303. We might class among the witnesses in the East during the second century, as we are speaking in the name of the churches of Alexandria, Smyrna, and Ephesus, first of all *Pantænus*, the celebrated missionary of eastern nations, and the teacher of Clement of Alexandria; next, Ignatius and Polycarp, who, without expressly mentioning this epistle, allude to it very clearly; and, lastly, Irenæus himself, who, before his settlement in Gaul, (in 178,) belonged to Asia by his education. In fact, though this

[1] It has been thought that Clement was speaking here of the pious Pantænus, the apostle of India, who was living at Alexandria in 216, where he had established a school, and where Clement himself was one of his disciples.

[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., v., 10; Jerome, De Viris Illustr., xxxv.

[3] Irenæus, Adv. Haeres., iii., 1.

father has not clearly cited the epistle in his work on heresies,[1] he has made mention of it, according to what Eusebius tells us, and has cited certain passages in one of his works that is now lost.[2] But we prefer coming to the very age of the apostles.

Section Fifth.

WITNESSES OF THE EAST IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

304. In the first century we shall find, not in the East only, but also in the West, proof in abundance of the admission, already begun, of this epistle into the canon of Scripture, at Rome equally with Babylon. On the one hand, we see it translated in the first century into Syriac in the most ancient of the versions—the Peshito;—and, on the other, we can cite in its favour two unexceptionable witnesses, both contemporaries of Paul, and both martyrs. It was not without strong reasons that Clement of Alexandria and Origen had said that in their time the epistle had in its favour "*ancient men.*" Who could be "*ancient men*" to them, unless the contemporaries of the apostles, or their immediate successors? These two testimonies which are left us to cite are, first, that of Clement of Rome, who, in his letter to the Corinthians, has made such frequent citations from our epistle,[3] as we have already shewn in our rapid analysis of it. He had it evidently in his hands when writing his letter. He does not name the author; but he cites whole passages from it, and paraphrases many others, and this fact, so prominent throughout his letter, has been already noticed by Eusebius and Jerome.

Our second witness is Simon Peter himself.

The Second Epistle of Peter, written a short time before his martyrdom, was addressed by him, as the apostle of the circum-

[1] Haeres., ii., 55, (Heb. i. 3;) iii., 6, (Heb. iii. 5;) iv., 26, (Heb. x. 1;) iv., 30, v., 5, (Heb. xi. 5.)

[2] Hist. Eccl., v., 26. It is in his book, Διαλέξεων διαφόρων· ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς . . . μνημονεύει, ῥητα τινα ἐξ (αὐτῆς) παραθέμενος.

[3] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 38. Clem. ad Cor., (Prop. 258,) ch. xxxvi., (Heb. i. 3–5, 7, 13–15, viii. 1–3;) ch. xvii., (Heb. iii. 2;) ch. xxi., (Heb. iv. 12;) ch. xxvii., (Heb. vi. 18;) ch. xxiii., (Heb. x. 37;) ch. ix., (Heb. xi. 5, 8, 31;) ch. x., (Heb. xi. 8;) ch. xii., (Heb. xi. 31;) ch. xviii., (Heb. iii. 2, xi. 2, 4, 5, 37, 39;) ch. lvi., (Heb. xii. 6;) ch. xliii., (Heb. iii. 5.)

cision, to the converted Hebrews.[1] He there speaks to them of another letter which Paul must have addressed to them, (iii. 15.) "*As our beloved brother Paul also*, according to the wisdom given unto him, *hath written to you*, as also in all his epistles." Paul, then, had written to these converted Hebrews. There must have existed somewhere a letter of his addressed to the Hebrews, and received as such by the churches of the circumcision; for it must be observed that Peter takes care to distribute Paul's letters into two classes—that which he had written to the Hebrews, and "*his other epistles*." This *letter of Paul to the Hebrews* could only be that to which all the churches of the East had given that title, and which they placed in the rank of his thirteen other letters.

305. Thus, then, the numerous testimonies, unanimous and constant, throughout the East in favour of the Epistle to the Hebrews go back in the Church to the highest antiquity. They can be traced without interruption or contradiction to the middle of the fifth century, and we have reckoned in this interval more than forty fathers among the Greeks who have received this epistle as Paul's. If two or three among them speak of certain doubts, it is not in their own name. Raised by others among the Latins, and slowly raised, these doubts were rejected by all the Orientals.

Section Sixth.

TESTIMONIES OF THE WEST.

306. It was otherwise among the churches of the West, but only setting out from the first half of the third century. After having been taught to reverence the Epistle to the Hebrews during the whole of the first century, the second, and the first years of the third, they ceased to render so constant a testimony to it as the churches of the East, and even went so far as almost all to give it up entirely, through the influence of Rome, for a very long time.

307. We have seen that, at the end of the first century, Rome furnished us, in the person of Clement, its bishop, with an unexceptionable witness of the belief which was then professed there.

[1] 2 Pet. i. 1; compare with 1 Pet. i. 1.

The same was the case with the other churches of the West during the whole course of the second century; for we have seen that Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, quoted it in one of his writings,[1] and if at a later period this same author, in his book against heresies, avoided the express mention of it, it has been supposed that, occupying an eminent position in the West, he thought it his duty to avoid furnishing arguments to the Montanists by quoting a book by which they supported their errors. So again, in Africa, Tertullian, who was a Montanist, had first of all alleged very expressly the Epistle to the Hebrews in the twentieth chapter of his treatise, *De Pudicitiâ*, composed, according to Cave, in the latter part of the second century. He there cites the Epistle to the Hebrews, and, in its whole length, the passage in which the writer declares that men who have fallen away after receiving certain illumination, "cannot be renewed again to repentance." He attributes the epistle to Barnabas, "the man whom Paul associated with himself," he says; "that companion of the apostles, taught by them, and teaching with them," (*alicujus apostolorum comitis;—quem Paulus juxta se posuerit, . . . qui ab apostolis didicet, et cum apostolis docuit.*) To these monuments of regard for this epistle which the Latin Church professed during the two first centuries and the first half of the third, we can now add a new important testimony, which has just been furnished us by the appearance of a long-lost work by Hippolytus the martyr "On Heresies."[2] This father, as is well known, though he came from the East, resided for a long time in Italy in the diocese of Rome. This long-lost work was printed at Oxford in 1851, very shortly after the discovery of the original. And as in 1628 the unexpected discovery of the Epistle of Clement of Rome changed the judgments formed by biblical critics respecting the authority which the Epistle to the Hebrews had in the first century in the Western Church, so in our own time the appearance of the work of Hippolytus, who cites the Epistle to the Hebrews as having apostolic authority,[3] has enlarged our views of the approval given to this scripture by the Western churches till the middle of the

[1] This was, as we have said, his βιβλίου τι διαλήξεων διαφόρων. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., v., 26.

[2] Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσιων ἔλεγχος.

[3] See Bunsen's Hippolytus; 4 vols.; London, 1852. Vol. i., p. 127.

third century. The death of Hippolytus is placed about the year 240.

308. It was at Rome, about the beginning of the third century, that the same presbyter Caius, who is reputed to have started the first doubts respecting the Apocalypse, also was the first to express similar doubts respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews in a treatise against the Montanists. From this period it seems that the credit of this scripture declined among the Latins, so that Tertullian, who, before the attacks of Caius, had quoted it freely, referred to it with a kind of reserve in his subsequent writings, in deference to the Latin Church. This is a remark of Hug. The canon of Muratori, of which the date is uncertain, though attributed by many to Caius, is certainly posterior to Marcion; it does not contain the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] And after Tertullian, Cyprian, in the same locality, did not receive it. He names seven churches to which Paul wrote, and does not speak of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[2] From that time the Latins expressed themselves to the same purport, till towards the end of the following century.

309. The cause of this deviation of the Western churches, as we have already said, is not unknown. The Montanist controversy had first suggested it to Caius; and when, half a century later, the Novatianists renewed the doctrine, and the rigorous discipline of Montanus, supporting it, as he did, on this scripture, as we learn from Jerome, Augustin, and Epiphanius, the Latins, desirous of combating them more advantageously, were induced to reject it. And we have already heard Philastrius tell us expressly, that the liturgical use of this epistle ceased in some churches, *on account of what it says of repentance*, (vi. 4, &c.,) and *on account of the Novatians;*[3] but he classes these notions and usages among the *heresies of certain persons*, (*haeresis quorumdam de Epistola Pauli ad Hebraeos.*)

310. Yet it must be understood that this late and temporary opposition of the Latins, so far from weakening our faith in the

[1] See Propp. 193, 198.

[2] Cyprian, Testim. ad. Judaeos, i., 20; De Exhortatione Martyr, cap. ii. Propp. 62, 63.

[3] De Haeresibus, 40; Bibl. Patrum Max., v., p. 711. "De poenitentia autem propter Novatianos."

canonicity of this book, ought rather to serve for its confirmation, since it proves to us the inability of all its assailants to bring against it any historical fact, any opposite tradition, or any argument of importance. If a work of Cicero were presented to us, which all the writers of the same age had unanimously attributed to him, and which all of the next century had always included in the collection of his works, we should not make a difficulty of believing it to be his, even if we should be told of persons far from Rome, and three centuries after him, who, without giving good reasons, or disputing the existence of the testimony of antiquity, had simply raised against the book the same objections which one of our contemporaries might make in the present day.

311. But, whatever might be the opposition of the Latins during the last half of the third century, and the first half of the following, our epistle, which had never ceased to be received by all the Greeks, began anew, from the middle of this fourth century, to be received in the West. In 354, Hilary of Poitiers regarded it as Paul's. He was followed by Ambrose, bishop of Milan; by Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, and by many others; until, at last, Jerome and Augustin, better informed than their contemporaries, enlightened them on this question by appealing to the historic proofs, to the testimony of the Orientals, and to the authority of all Christian antiquity. It was, probably, their influence which caused it to be received as Paul's by the Council of Carthage, in 397. From the fifth century, all the churches, to our own day, have received it.

Section Seventh.

Recapitulation of these testimonies.

312. From all these facts we conclude:—

(1.) That the canonicity of the epistle, immediately after its publication, was acknowledged in the West, as well as in the East —at Rome, as at Jerusalem.

(2.) That the same testimony was rendered later, without interruption, throughout the East, among Syriac Christians and Greek Christians.

(3.) That this recognition continued among the western churches during the second century and the first half of the third.

(4.) That if the Latin Christians, and especially those of Rome, hesitated in reference to it, or even refused to receive it, during the latter half of the third century and the first half of the fourth, they at last came over unanimously to the primitive testimony of the universal church, which had been the constant and invariable testimony of the churches of the East.

(5.) That the Church of Rome has varied, and gravely erred on this important point; and that if, for 1500 years, it has remained obedient to the authority of the constant testimony of the East, it, nevertheless, maintained on this subject (to employ the language of Tertullian, Augustin, and Philastrius, against those who rejected any of the books of the second-first canon) a *heresy* of two centuries.[1]

(6.) That if this long-retained error, before the epoch of the definitive settlement of the canon, has no importance for the question of its providential preservation, because the churches were not to be entirely unanimous on the whole entire canon till that epoch, yet the fact is of crushing weight against the pretensions of a Church which styles itself the judge of controversies and of the truth.

(7.) That this same Church errs at the present day, if not more gravely, at least more irrationally, in assuming, in spite of such manifest facts, to be the infallible depository of the Scriptures for all other churches, and in repeating, after Gregory VII.,[2] "that no chapter of any book in the Bible can be held to be canonical without the authority of the sovereign pontiff."

(8.) That what Christianity owes to the Church of Rome in this matter is, that it has twice made war on the canon, and twice broken on this point the unity of the Church; first of all, by rejecting for two centuries an epistle which had been recognised by herself for the two preceding centuries, and which she has recognised afresh from the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth; next, in presuming alone, ten centuries later, to introduce the Apocryphal books into the canon of the Old Testament, in spite of the strong remonstrances of all the rest of Christendom, which, while causing them to be read publicly, had always rejected them for fifteen centuries both in the East and the West.

[1] The two former apply to the rejection of the Apocalypse; the third to that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (See Propp. 282, 302.)

[2] See the Annales of Baronius for the year 1076.

(9.) That the infallibility assumed by Rome, as the patrimony of the apostle Simon Peter, is already condemned by the single fact that it has not been able to guard a scripture which the same Simon Peter had expressly recommended as making a part of the sacred oracles, and which had been recommended also a very short time after by that Clement whom it has made the second, or third, or fourth of its own bishops.[1]

(10.) That, very far from giving authority to our canon of the New Testament, the Church of Rome has received its own from the Greek Church, (at least as far as concerns the Epistle to the Hebrews,) and that it has not been owing to it that we have not lost throughout the West this holy scripture.

(11.) Lastly, that the authority of the canon as to the New Testament is founded neither on Rome, which, by its own confession, has gravely varied and erred respecting it, nor on any particular church, nor on any provincial council, nor on any universal council, but only on the unanimous, unpremeditated, involuntary, and providential consent of all Christendom on this subject. For, with enormous divergences on every other subject, we see at the present day throughout the world all churches, good and bad, kept by God in unity on this one point; as we see, on the other hand, the whole ancient nation of Israel, and all the modern Jews, remain equally in unity respecting the Old Testament, because the oracles of God were confided to them for the Old, as they are to us for the New. But we can only glance at this thought here, since it is out of the circle of our present investigations.

Section Eighth.

THE PAULINE[2] AUTHORSHIP OF THIS EPISTLE.

313. The Pauline authorship of this epistle must be carefully distinguished from its canonicity in studying the history of the

[1] The second, according to Jerome; the third, according to Augustin; the fourth, according to Irenæus. See Hefele, Patr. Apostol. Opera, p. 21. Tubing., 1847.

[2] On this subject the reader may consult the first volume of Moses Stuart; the Theses of Professor La Harpe, (Toulouse, 1832;) the Introduction of Hug, and that of Guericke, (1854;) and Fr. Spanheim, De Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebr. Exercitationes, Heidelberg, 1659. (He maintains the Pauline authorship.)

canon. The *apostolicity* of a book, indeed, would not alone be a reason of its canonicity, because all the writings, discourses, and actions of an apostle or a prophet were not necessarily nor continually inspired. Inspiration was a miraculous gift, (*χάρισμα*,) and miraculous gifts were intermittent according as the Spirit descended on the men of God. A scripture was infallible and Divine when the Spirit of God had caused it to be written, and only then; and the Spirit of God caused it to be written when He saw good, whether the writer was an apostle, as Paul or Peter, or whether he was not an apostle, but only a prophet, as Luke or Mark.

Many fathers of the first ages believed this epistle to be Divine, without believing it to be Paul's; and many modern theologians, on other accounts worthy of regard, have thought it right to apply this distinction to the Epistle to the Hebrews. In our opinion they are mistaken as to fact, but not as to principle. Thus our two greatest reformers, Luther and Calvin, spoke at a time when this subject was less studied, and, particularly, when Clement's epistle had not been recovered, who, at Rome, and in the very age of the apostles, bears so clear a testimony to this holy scripture.[1] Luther attributed it to Apollos, without supporting this gratuitous conjecture by any historical argument. Calvin himself, without attempting any hypothesis, wrote at the head of his commentary, "*Ego ut Paulum agnoscam auctorem, adduci nequeo.* Yet for myself," he adds, "I receive it without any difficulty among the apostolic epistles; and I doubt not that it is only by a device of Satan that some persons were formerly found disposed to exclude it from the number of authentic books." Beza also says, in the first note of his commentary, "Let the judgments of men remain free on this point; only (he adds) let us all agree to this, that this epistle was really dictated by the Holy Spirit."

314. Many of the fathers who were most attached to the canonicity of this epistle, (such as Dionysius and Clement of Alexandria, Euthalius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Jerome,) have

[1] It was only in 1628 that Cyril Lucar sent from Constantinople to Charles I. of England the ancient Alexandrian manuscript of the Scriptures, which, happily was found to contain the long-lost epistle of Clement.

yet supposed, on account of its elegance, that it was composed in Hebrew by Paul, but translated into Greek by Luke or Barnabas. This is only a hypothesis. It does not directly affect its canonicity; but we reject it, because there are three powerful reasons which unite to impugn it.

(1.) Those persons who speak of this Hebrew original have never pointed out any one who has seen it.

(2.) The superior elegance of this epistle may be accounted for, as we shall presently shew.

(3.) It would be an historic error to imagine that Hebrew, in Paul's days, was better adapted than Greek to the religious wants of the whole Jewish people. Greek was universally understood, even in Jerusalem; it was spoken in that city about four centuries before;[1] and the Jews of "the dispersion," who made use of it throughout the East, often knew nothing of Hebrew. Thus we see that the greater part of the Christian Jews in Jerusalem had separate synagogues to celebrate their worship in Greek.

(4.) Nothing in this epistle indicates a translation; everything, on the contrary, bears the impress of originality.

(5.) Paranomasias, that is to say, allusions founded on the similarity and vocal affinity of expressions, abound in it, and betray inevitably an original writing.[2] Particularly, Calvin remarks, "What is said of the nature of a testament in the ninth chapter can be taken from no other source than a Greek word."

(6.) The comments of the author on the passages he cites from the Old Testament lead also to the same conclusion; for they attest that the citations have been taken, not from the Hebrew original, but from the Septuagint version.[3]

315. Though many fathers and many scholars, while admitting the divinity of this scripture, have wished to find another author than Paul for it, we shall be able, on the contrary, to establish by strong arguments that it was indeed our apostle who wrote it.

[1] The city submitted to Alexander the Great in the year 332 B.C., and the epistle was written about A.D. 64.

[2] See, in the Greek, Heb. ii. 7, 8, (compared with Ps. viii.,) v. 8, 14, vii. 13, 19, ix. 10, x. 34, xi. 37, xiii. 14.

[3] See Heb. x. 4, 5, compared with Ps. xl. 7; viii. 8, ix. 14, 22, compared with Jer. xxxi. 31, 32, and other passages quoted in Dr Owen's learned exposition, (5th exercitation.)

(1.) Nothing has ever been alleged against this testimony of history excepting presumptions and conjectures.

(2.) The expressions of the epistle about Timothy can belong, it appears, to no one but Paul. "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you," (xiii. 23.) Now Paul had already associated himself with Timothy in seven other of his epistles,[1] besides writing two to him. He made him his companion in his voyage to Jerusalem, (Acts xx. 4.) He often speaks of him elsewhere, as here, as "his brother and fellow-labourer."[2] He even calls him "his son," (1 Tim. i. 2,) while no other person in the New Testament presents, even distantly, this character of intimacy with Timothy.

(3.) The author of this epistle speaks of his "bonds," (x. 34,) and Paul was in bonds when this epistle was written.

(4.) The author tells the Hebrews that he hopes to visit them soon, ("with whom, if he comes shortly, I will see you.") Paul was then on the point of being released from confinement.

(5.) The author salutes them in the name of "the brethren of Italy," (xiii. 21,) and Paul was then in Italy.

(6.) The epistle must have been written during the reign of Nero, and in Paul's lifetime, that is, before the year 68 or 65. In fact,

It represents the temple at Jerusalem as still standing, and its worship as still celebrated—the last war of the Romans against the Jews as about to commence: "As ye see the day approaching," (x. 25;) (but that terrible day had not yet dawned.)

Timothy is still living, and inclined to leave Italy, in order to visit the Hebrews with the author of this letter.

The letter is cited by Clement, *the companion of Paul*, (Phil. iv. 3,) in the epistle which this father wrote to the Corinthians in the name of the Church of Rome. And notice, on this fact, the reasoning of Eusebius himself. "Clement, in his letter to the Corinthians," he says, "introduces many thoughts from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and even with the peculiar expressions of this

[1] Phil. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; Rom. xvi. 21; Philem. 1.

[2] 2 Cor. i. 1; Philem. 1; Col. i. 1.

epistle, indicating evidently by this that it was not to him a new work."[1]

Lastly, this letter is cited even by the apostle Peter, who is said to have suffered martyrdom in the same year as Paul; for we have seen that in his second epistle, written to the same persons as the first, (2 Pet. iii. 1,) he reminds them that Paul had written a letter to them,—"As our beloved brother Paul also, according unto the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you," (2 Pet. iii. 15.)

(7.) All the weight of historic testimony is in favour of the Pauline authorship of this epistle. It is certain that, being addressed especially to the church at Jerusalem, the mother of all the rest, and for thirty-six years the centre of Israelitish Christianity, it was read from the first as Paul's in all the assemblies of the East. We have already seen the testimonies of the East to its canonicity for four centuries. But these same fathers, while speaking sometimes of doubts entertained among the Latins, not only believed Paul to be the author, but said that they received this belief from *the ancient bishops who preceded them.* Cyril of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, stating it to be his, declares that such was the tradition "of the apostles and ancient bishops, the presidents of the churches," (Prop. 59.) Jerome likewise attests that this epistle "ab omnibus *retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus* QUASI PAULI *apostoli suscipi.*" Athanasius, the Council of Laodicea, Basil, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephrem the Syrian, Chrysostom, and many others, give the same testimony. Eusebius declares it to be Paul's, saying, at the same time, that the church of the Romans disputed the fact, supposing that Clement of Rome might have been the translator. Theodoret cites Eusebius as having said *that all the ancients believed it was written by Paul.* He says that the Arians had begun to call it in question, on account of the testimony it bears to the divinity of Jesus Christ; but he adds, *that it was read in the churches from apostolic times.*[2] Origen,[3] while believing it to be Paul's, cites, nevertheless, in

[1] Hist. Eccl., iii, 38. Σαφίστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νεὸν ὑπαρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα.

[2] Arg. in Epist. ad Hebraeos. Opp., tom. iii., p. 341. Halle, 1768-1774.

[3] Origen, who quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews more than two hundred

order to explain its great elegance, suppositions, the *report* of which (he says) had reached him,[1] respecting the part that this or the other apostolic man had taken in its composition; but yet he takes care to remind his readers, that it is not a light thing (εἰκῇ) that ancient men have transmitted it as Paul's to the men of his time. And, lastly, Clement of Alexandria, in the second century, tells us expressly that it is the work of Paul, (*Παύλου μὲν εἶναί φησι,*) though thinking that perhaps it was written in Hebrew by the apostle, and was translated by Luke into elegant Greek.

(8.) Lastly, the very numerous marks of resemblance between this epistle and the other compositions of Paul, equally attest that he is its author. Many able critics have exhibited these marks with great distinctness. We may see them more closely in Spanheim, Braun, Carpsovius, Lardner, Macknight, La Harpe, Moses Stuart, and Tholuck; and Reuss himself,[2] who does not ascribe this epistle to Paul, has had the candour to express himself in the following terms on these analogies:—

"The resemblances which our epistle presents to the Pauline modes of expression are so numerous and striking, that the readiness with which it is ascribed to Paul is not at all surprising. They consist in a series of terms equally familiar to the two authors, as well as, in the main, of the same doctrinal ideas.

"We shall proceed to point out some of these resemblances:—

"Bursts of feeling, expressed in language very concise, and familiar to St Paul.

"Elliptical expressions, which must be completed by what goes before and what follows.

"Abrupt transitions to subordinate subjects, with a quick return to the principal topic.[3]

"Answers addressed to the thoughts of the reader, and applying to objections which are not expressed.

"A hortatory and moral conclusion of the epistle, from the

times, (Kirchhofer, Quellensammlung, &c., p. 244,) repeatedly asserts that it was by Paul.

[1] Εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία.

[2] Hist. de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique, tom. ii., p. 550.

[3] See i. 2-4, iii. 7, 11, 14, iv. 2.

eleventh chapter, such as Paul was accustomed to make in his other epistles.

"Exhortations very similar to those made by Paul elsewhere.

"Jewish interpretations of Scripture which are only found in St Paul's writings.

"Doctrines that none of the other inspired writers have mentioned: the mediation and intercession of the Saviour;[1] the title of *Mediator* given by Paul alone to Jesus Christ;[2] Christ presenting His sacrifice in heaven, and exercising His priesthood only in heaven.

"Frequent resemblances of style and expression between this epistle and the thirteen others of Paul;—for example, the frequent use of the particle τέ; or, again, this passage, Heb. xiii. 5, compared with Rom. xii. 9, where we find two nominatives absolute, and besides a feminine noun in the nominative absolute, followed by a masculine participle in the nominative absolute, (ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, ἀποστυγοῦντες . . .) a structure which is found nowhere else in the New Testament.

"Take, as examples, again, the following passages:—

"Heb. ii. 4, compared with Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; and 2 Thess. ii. 9; Heb. iii. 1, compared with Phil. iii. 14; Heb. v. 12, compared with 1 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. viii. 1, compared with Eph. i. 21; Heb. ix., x. 1, compared with Col. ii. 17; Heb. x. 33, compared with 1 Cor. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 9, compared with Eph. iv. 14; Heb. xiii. 10, 11, compared with 1 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 20, 21, compared with Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 11."

But what can our opponents set against all these arguments of criticism and history? No historical testimony, only presumptions and hypotheses. These we shall proceed to answer.

Section Ninth.

OBJECTIONS.

316. It is objected, in the first place, that Paul the apostle to the Gentiles was not the apostle of the Jews, and was not bound to

[1] Heb. iv. 15, 16, vii. 22, 25; Rom. viii. 24; Gal. iii. 19, 20.
[2] Heb. vii. 22, viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

write to them. But does he not say that he was the apostle of all, that "he might by all means save some?" (1 Cor ix. 19, 22.) Did he not in every city begin his ministry with the Hebrews? Was he not "a Hebrew of the Hebrews?" (Phil. iii. 5.) Was it not his "heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel that they might be saved?" (Rom. x. 1.) Was he not "in great heaviness and continual sorrow" for the Hebrews, his "kinsmen according to the flesh?" (ix. 2.) Had he not very recently gone up to the capital of the Hebrews to carry to his "nation the alms" of the churches? (Rom. xv. 25; Acts xxiv. 17.) Could he do otherwise (we ask, on the contrary) than write to them?

317. Paul, it is said, again, has not named himself in the epistle; while he had always taken care to inscribe at the head of his thirteen letters his name and apostolic title. We reply—

(1.) That he had manifest reasons of prudence, if not entirely to conceal his name, at least not to make it prominent. We have stated them elsewhere.

(2.) That the book being rather a treatise than a letter, the author had not the same reasons for putting his name.[1]

(3.) That the book, whoever was the author, was written by a person who judged it desirable not to put his name. "And if any argues that for this reason it was not Paul's, (said Primasius, an African bishop of the sixth century,) it could not be any more by Barnabas, nor by Clement, nor by Luke, nor by any one else, since no one has put his name to it, (*quod nullius nomine titulatur.*)"[2]

(4.) Those Hebrew Christians to whom the letter was at first addressed certainly knew what hand had written it. Can we doubt it when we read the words, "Pray for us. I beseech you to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner. Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you. Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you," (xiii. 18, 19, 23, 24.)

(5.) It is sufficiently evident that this letter would not have

[1] It is short for a treatise, and would be long for a letter, (303 verses.) The author, also, at the close, apologises for its brevity.

[2] Ad Hebraeos Praefatio, Lugduni, 1537, p. 473.

been read, from the first century in Jerusalem and in the assemblies of the East, if the leaders of all these churches had not known the author.

(6.) It was desirable that it should circulate among the believing Hebrews, the Judaising Christians, and the unconverted Hebrews; but it would have been imprudent to have placed at its head a name which would have made them reject it without examination.

(7.) Lastly, we may say with Dr Wordsworth,[1] that if the name of Paul is not at its head, yet his farewell and his signature are at the end; for the apostolic salutation which he was wont to use, was, as he said himself, his distinctive mark in all his letters.[2] "The salutation of Paul with my own hand, which is the token in every epistle; so I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all;" by which he means to say, that these words, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you," or their equivalent, were the formula of salutation which he took care to write *with his own hand* at the end of every letter. We know that he always dictated them, with the single exception of the Epistle to the Galatians. He contented himself with putting this token or signature. *It was a token*, he said himself, by which all his epistles might be recognised. But it must be carefully observed, that while this formula is read in all the thirteen other letters of Paul, it does not occur in any of the epistles written during his lifetime by any other of the apostles, and that we only see it employed, after his death, in the last verse of the Apocalypse, and in the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, and in the discourses of the fathers, who were eager to adopt it after him. But this mark, invariably and exclusively attached to all his letters, is equally so to the Epistle to the Hebrews, (xiii. 24, 26.)

318. In the third place, it is objected that Paul said, that he was "not taught the gospel by any man," (Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, ii. 6–15;) and shewed himself very jealous of the independence of his ministry. Could he then say of the salvation which he announced those words which are read in the third verse of the second chapter, "the salvation which first began to be spoken by

[1] On the Canon, p. 234. London, 1847.

[2] 2 Thess. iii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18.

the Lord, and was confirmed unto US by them that heard him?" We reply, that it was one of Paul's habits to employ the first person plural when he had only his readers in view; so that no conclusion could be drawn in reference to his own person. Thus, for example, in the preceding part of the verse he had said, "How shall WE escape if we neglect so great salvation?" Paul, in speaking of this danger, was thinking of his readers, and not of himself. And so again, when he said in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, (verse 11th,) "Now it is high time to awake out of sleep," he was not asleep himself, and had no idea of including himself in the WE, which he employed simply as *a communicative pronoun*, (*un pronom communicatif.*) Yet even as to Paul it would be true that the salvation "spoken by the Lord was confirmed to him by those who heard it."

319. But, lastly, the objection urged most strongly to prove that this epistle could not have been written by Paul is the classic purity of its language, the Hellenic finish of the composition.

(1.) Our answer to this is, that it was quite natural that the apostle on this solemn occasion should think it his duty to bestow more care on this writing, which formed a treatise rather than a letter, and which he addressed to all the Hebrew nation. He wished to exhibit to his people, in an attractive representation, the holy and majestic unity of the Divine revelations under the two economies —the innumerable relations of the Old Testament to the New— the beneficent and glorious light which the later manifestations of the Son of God shed upon Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets. He developed to the Hebrews the importance and sublime meaning of their own *cultus* when explained by the gospel, the Divinity of the Messiah announced in their scriptures, His holy humanity and humiliation equally foretold, His apostleship, His royal priesthood, His expiatory blood, and His ascension to the heavens; in a word, the true Temple, the true Priest, the true Tabernacle, the true Victim, the true Passover, the true Holy of Holies, and likewise the true faith of the true worshippers, and their true sacrifices of praise and oblation.

(2.) There is not a writer who has not had, among his compositions, some writing or other in which he has aimed to surpass himself, in the purity of its language, and the elevation of its

style. Thus Cyprian, in his letter to Donatus; thus Tertullian, in his Apology; thus Calvin, in his treatise on clemency, or in his epistle to Francis I.; thus St Paul himself, in his letter to Philemon.

(3.) Do we not know that the apostle, independently of his inspiration, was, in respect of style, equal to his theme, both by education and genius? Was he not born, and was he not taught Greek literature, in the Greek colony of Tarsus, a city renowned for its culture? Was he not heard to cite, on many occasions, the Greek poets? (Acts xiii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Titus i. 12;) and does he not shew, in other parts of his writings, what he was able to do? If he was, as he said, "a common man as to speech," (ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ,) it was in his accent, and not in expression or thought. And, if he judged it wise to write letters to the Gentiles without preparation, he might also think it wise to address one to his own people in a composition more captivating and more studied.

320. We must, then, conclude, from all these testimonies and facts, that Eusebius, at the beginning of the fourth century, very legitimately included our Epistle to the Hebrews in the first canon; because it had been received for two centuries by all Christendom, both Eastern and Western, from its first appearance; and because it had never ceased to be received by all the churches of the East. Yet while, like this father, putting it, according to our historical estimate, among the *homologoumena*, and in the first canon, we have thought proper to assign it and the Apocalypse a place by themselves, on account of the late opposition made for a time against it by the Latin Church only. Moreover, that church, which owned the authority of this sacred book during the first and second century, and then disowned it during the third and fourth, has ended by ranking it, for fourteen hundred years, in conformity with the universal Church.

But we must now pass on to the second canon, or to the *antilegomena*, which contain (as we have said) only 222 verses, a thirty-sixth of the New Testament; and we shall establish their firm authenticity, like the first, by history, before proceeding to consider them under another point of view.

BOOK IV.

THE SECOND CANON; OR, THE FIVE ANTILEGOMENA.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL FACTS.

321. If the twenty scriptures of the first canon, as soon as they appeared, were received as divine by all the churches of Christendom, and if the two books which compose the second-first were, at first, universally admitted, it was not so with the five small late epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude. Accepted by "a great number," says Eusebius, they were not universally accepted, because sent to Christian people just at the moment when their authors were about to disappear by death, and, moreover, addressed to the whole body of believers, they had not the same advantages as the greater part of the other apostolic writings for being at once universally received. For this purpose there was wanting either the personal influence and presence of the sacred writers, or the immediate testimony of the men, or of the churches, to whom all the non-catholic epistles were at first addressed. Consequently, we can understand how they were admitted more slowly in certain more distant parts of the Christian world. While a majority of the churches received these five epistles from the first, as making a part of the Sacred Scriptures, there were always many, during two centuries and a half, who remained in

suspense as to the Divine authority of one or other among them; and it was only at the beginning of the fourth century, about the year 325, that these hesitations ceased in all parts of the East and West. It was thus that their universal and absolute adoption into the sacred canon came to be deferred. But this very delay, by attesting at once the liberty and the sacred jealousy of the primitive churches on the subject of the canon, should serve, as we shall soon see, only to render our confidence more entire in the peaceable and final result of this sacred investigation.

322. Origen, at least according to a report of Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.*, vi., 25,) said of the two last epistles of John, "that not all Christians received them as authentic, (*οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας;*)" and of the Second Epistle of Peter, that "it was called in question, (*ἀμφιβάλλεται.*)" In like manner, Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii., 25,) at the beginning of the fourth century, said that the epistles of James and Jude, and the second of Peter, and the two last of John, were controverted, (*ἀντιλεγομέναι,*) though, at the same time, acknowledged by a great number, (*γνωρίμων δ' ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς.*) He says again, "Though controverted, they are yet acknowledged by the greater part of ecclesiastical persons." And as to the two epistles of James and Jude, he has said, "It is well known that these also are publicly read with the rest of the scriptures, (*ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις.*)"

We have already shewn in our First Book, that all the eleven catalogues of the fourth century which remain to us contain alike the seven catholic epistles, that of Athanasius, and of the anonymous author inserted in his works, (Prop. 67,) of Epiphanius, of Jerome, of Rufinus, of Augustin, of the Council of Laodicea, of the Council of Carthage, of Cyril of Jerusalem, of Gregory of Nazianzus, of Amphilochius, and of Philastrius.

323. If the seven last epistles of the New Testament have from ancient times been called *catholic*, it is because they were addressed to the general body of Christians, rather than to a particular church or person. It is also, perhaps, because this name, confined at first to the First Epistle of Peter and the first of John, as to books *universally* received, was afterwards extended to the five later received epistles, when their Divine authority had been gene-

rally admitted. But whatever may have been the meaning or the origin of this term, its use to designate the seven epistles which are not Paul's is of high antiquity. Not only do we find it in Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, in the fourth century, but in Eusebius at the end of the third, or rather at the entrance of the fourth, in Dionysius of Alexandria before Eusebius, in the middle of the third, and in Origen before Dionysius.

324. We have already stated more than once that the order in which the different books of the New Testament were respectively placed from the most ancient times was constantly that which is observed in our modern Bibles, excepting that the whole of the seven epistles called catholic[1] preceded the collection of Paul's fourteen epistles. But even then, both in each category were respectively arranged as we see them now. As to the seven catholic epistles, the most ancient collections of the Greeks, as well as our modern Bibles, have always placed them in the following order—first, that of James, then the two of Peter, then the three of John, and, lastly, that of Jude. This order is declared to be the true one by Jerome, who informs us, also, that in his time the Latins, by an indiscreet zeal for Peter, had thought of giving the preference to his epistles over that of James; "but, by the help of God, (*Deo nos juvante,*)" he says,[2] "I have re-established them in the order wisely followed by the Greeks." This order is founded on their importance and length. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, (ii. 9,) speaks of "*James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars,*" and it is in the same order (James, Peter, and John,) that their epistles have been arranged.

It will then be suitable in this review, in which we propose to establish their authenticity, to begin with James.

[1] Already from the times of Eusebius, Cyril, and Athanasius. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., vi., 14; Athanasius, Epist. Festal; Conc. Laod., 59; Cyril, Catech., iv.

[2] Prol. in Epist. Canon. "Non idem ordo apud Graecos qui integre sapiunt et fidem rectam sectantur. *Epistolarum septem* quae canonicae nuncupantur qui in Latinis codicibus invenitur. Quod quia Petrus primus est in numero apostolorum primae sint etiam ejus epistolae in ordine caeterarum. Sed has proprio ordine, *Deo nos juvante,* reddidimus. Est enim prima earum una Jacobi, Petri duae, Johannis tres, et Judæ una."

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

SECTION FIRST.

ITS IMPORTANCE.

325. THIS epistle, to judge only by its author, is the first of the Catholic Epistles, and James begins it with these words—"James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad."

In the primitive churches, but especially among Christians of the Israelitish race, it must have acquired a particular importance from the eminent place which its author occupied among all the apostles, among all the bishops, among all the eye-witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and among all the martyrs.

We say, among all the apostles. Not only was James *a brother of the Lord*[1] according to the flesh, that is, either his half brother or his first cousin, being, according to some, the son of his mother by Alpheus, or, according to others, his first cousin, the son of Mary, the sister of his mother, who kept her station so faithfully near the cross, and again at the sepulchre, (Matt. xxvii. 6, xxviii. 1;) but, further, he was held in such respect among all the apostles (Gal. ii. 16) that Peter, when he dissembled at Antioch, feared "certain *that came from James*," (Gal. ii. 12;) and, on leaving the prison at Jerusalem, he says at once, distinguishing him from all the rest, "Go, shew these things unto James and to

[1] Gal. i. 19. Jesus had at least four brothers—James, Joses, Jude, and Simon, (Mark vi. 3.)

all the brethren," (Acts xii. 17.) Paul himself names him as the first of the three *pillars* of the primitive Church, (Gal. ii. 9.)

Distinguished, as we have said, among all the bishops, he presided for twenty-seven years over that church at Jerusalem which was the centre and focus, the model and mother, of all the others; by his superior influence he concluded the first council; he was the special object of regard to Paul, Peter, and the apostles, who, twenty years after their Lord's ascension, still assembled with all the elders in his house, (Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18.) During more than a quarter of a century he conciliated, as we learn from the historian Josephus, the respect of the Jews, who surnamed him the Just, and who reproached themselves for his cruel death,[1] regarding it as one of the causes of their national catastrophe.

Eminent, again, among the eye-witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, James was honoured (1 Cor. xv. 7) with a special appearance of the Lord, as Mary his mother had been on her way to the sepulchre, and Cleopas,[2] his father, on the way to Emmaus. Eminent, lastly, among all the martyrs, James was the first of the writers of the New Testament, and the second of the apostles, to give up his life for Jesus Christ. His colleague, James the Greater, the brother of John, had been beheaded by order of Herod Agrippa only ten years after the Saviour's ascension; but our James, *the brother of the Lord*, was stoned by order of the high priest Ananias and the council of the Jews sixteen or seventeen years later, while they were expecting at Jerusalem the arrival of Albinus, the successor of Festus.[3]

Thus Jude, at the head of his epistle, thought he could not better recommend himself to the respect of the churches than by entitling himself simply "Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, and *brother of James*," so great among all the people of God was the notoriety of this holy apostle, and probably also of his epistle. And it is on this account, Theodoret[4] supposed that Paul himself alludes to James, the bishop of the Hebrews, and to his generous

[1] Antiq., xx., 8; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., ii., 1.

[2] Yet this name is not the same as Alpheus; and, as we have said elsewhere, it remains very doubtful whether James was the *cousin*, and not the *brother*, (strictly speaking,) of Jesus.

[3] Albinus had arrived in October 61, at the feast of tabernacles.—*Josephus, De Bello Jud.*, vi., 31.

[4] Comment. on Heb. xiii. 7.

martyrdom, when he wrote to the Hebrews, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation, (xiii. 7.)

326. The Epistle of James, having for its author a man of such eminence—one of *the three pillars*—a brother of Jude—a brother of Jesus Christ—a bishop advanced in life—possessed among Christians of immense influence, and even honoured by all the Jewish people—an apostle,—in fine, who was, it is said, the only one who had never quitted Jerusalem, and who had governed[1] the mother-church for a quarter of a century in that city, where it was reckoned there were at least fifty or sixty thousand Jewish Christians;[2]—the Epistle of James, addressed by such a man to these twelve *tribes of dispersed Jews* who came from year to year to Jerusalem,—this epistle, we say, would find ready access to all the Hebrew Christians of Palestine and the East, and the latter in their turn would continue to circulate it in the most distant countries of their dispersion.

Section Second.

ITS IMMEDIATE RECEPTION BY THAT PORTION OF THE CHURCH TO WHICH IT WAS FIRST ADDRESSED.

327. We see that the Eastern Church has, from the first, received this scripture as authentic, and that the most ancient fathers made use of it. There is abundant proof that it was immediately admitted and constantly revered as a book of God among the churches descended from Israel.

We find the most decisive proof of this fact in this, that the epistle was translated in the first century by the Syriac Christians into their famous Peshito version, which belongs, as we have said, to the apostolic age, (Prop. 32,) and was even made so early that the two last epistles of John, the second of Peter, and that of

[1] We say *governed*, without presuming to decide on the form of the administration which the churches of God practised in a great city such as Jerusalem.

[2] Acts xxi. 20, (πόσαι μυριάδες.)

Jude, could not be inserted, any more than the Apocalypse,[1] because they appeared at a later period.

But this immediate admission of the Epistle of James by such churches, presents us in its favour an argument of the greatest force; since better judges of its Divine authority cannot be imagined than those Christians among whom James had laboured twenty-seven years, and to whom he had directly addressed it.

This scripture was, then, received as inspired in the age of its author, in the very places where he had so long preached, and by the persons who were best qualified to appreciate his character, his divine mission, and the authenticity of his epistle.

328. Yet Eusebius places it among the books *which some controvert.* "The doubt," Kirchhofer remarks,[2] "probably proceeded from the uncertainty to which James it was to be ascribed; for no other historical testimony can be brought against it."

Section Third.

ITS DATE.

329. We cannot doubt that the epistle was written towards the end of James's career; for as soon as we examine it with a view to its date, we recognise in it numerous signs of an epoch comparatively late. The extensive dispersion of the Jewish churches, their organisation already completed, and their degeneracy far advanced, their forgetfulness of the marks of justifying faith, the influence of their wealth, the care required on the part of the apostle to remind them of the place of works in the evangelical economy, the high authority he had then acquired in the Jewish churches, the long experience indicated by his language—all these traits combined lead us to fix a date for this scripture much later than the first formation of Christian churches.

[1] Hug, we have already said, (Prop. 35,) thinks that the Apocalypse was later, and for a time inserted in the Peshito.

[2] Geschichte des N. T. Canons, &c., p. 258. Zurich, 1842.

Section Fourth.

CAUSES OF THE HESITATION OF SOME CHURCHES.

330. If, on the one hand, the epistle was immediately and universally received by "these twelve tribes of the dispersion," (James i. 1,)—that is to say, by all the Jewish Christians of Palestine, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Asia Minor, to whom James had addressed it, as, also, by the churches of the Gentiles in more direct connexion with these Christian synagogues, and by the most ancient fathers; we may easily understand, on the other hand, why a small number of persons were slow to receive it, and why the testimonies in its favour, during the two first centuries, were comparatively few.

In fact, not only were they at a greater distance from this man of God, who never quitted, even to the day of his martyrdom, his important residence at Jerusalem, and who seems to have received for his special mission the constant government, for five-and-twenty years, of this mother-church; but, above all, many of them lost, by the misfortunes of the Jews, the facilities they would otherwise have had of acquiring an immediate and sufficient knowledge of the claims of this book to their acceptance. James had scarcely written it, when the Jewish churches were involved in the troubles of war, of flight, and of persecution. Very soon all the Judaising churches were broken up; and we know the strong dislike everywhere felt towards them, and the increasing prejudices entertained by the Gentile Christians against the Jewish converts.

According to all appearance, this epistle was written about the year 61, the epoch of the martyrdom of James, and the arrival of Albinus in Judea.[1] The oppression of the Jews under this bad man, and, soon after, under his successor, Florus, began almost immediately; for Josephus dates the ruin of the Jewish nation from the year 62.[2] Albinus, having learned, he tells us, that Florus was appointed to take his place, emptied the prisons of

[1] Others place it in 64, but, according to Josephus, it was in 62 that this governor scourged the famous Jesus, the son of Ananus.—*De Bell. Jud.*, vi., 5, § 3.

[2] Ἐξ ἐκείνου μάλιστα τοῦ καιροῦ . . . . προσκοπτόντων ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον.—*Antiq. Jud.*, xx., 8.

Jerusalem, and filled the whole country with disturbance. Florus, in the spring of 64, came like an executioner, rather than a governor; and his acts of injustice soon surpassed all belief. The year which followed was that of all those threatening prodigies which Tacitus and Josephus have reported as the precursors of frightful disasters. On the 15th of the following May, Florus, seated on his tribunal at Jerusalem, sent his soldiers to massacre three thousand six hundred and thirteen persons in the market-place; and, on the 4th of October, Cestius Gallus encamped with a Roman army before this guilty city, and planted "*the abomination of desolation* in the holy place, where it ought not to be." And it was at this sign, foretold by Jesus Christ, and by Daniel, that all the Christians, amounting to many myriads, "*fled to the mountains.*"[1]

We can understand that, in consequence of these extraordinary commotions, which followed so closely the appearance of this epistle, and put an end to the existence of the Jewish churches, that the Gentiles, among whom those churches were soon held in very great disrepute, were more slow to receive it, notwithstanding it had so many claims to their respect. And we may also understand that the direct testimonies of authors of this period among the Latins, and even among the Greeks, would be comparatively few.

Section Fifth.

WITNESSES.

331. Yet we must guard against believing that the testimonies of Gentile Christians are wanting. We can cite some of great value.

And, first of all, we find at Rome, in the first century, this epistle cited by frequent allusions in Clement's epistle, especially in chapters ii., x., xvii., xxiii., xxx., xxxi., xxxiii., xxxviii., xlvi., xlix.[2] We find it also cited in *The Shepherd of Hermas*, by seven allusions, which Lardner regards as a sufficient proof of

[1] Josephus, De Bello Jud., ii., 19, §§ 4–9; Matt. xxiv. 16; Mark xiii. 4; Luke xxi. 21; Dan. ix. 21, xi. 31.

[2] Read again our extract from this epistle, Propp. 254–260.

the knowledge the author had of it, whoever he might be.[1] In the same manner, four times in Irenæus,[2] and likewise in Tertullian.[3] The citations adduced from Clement of Alexandria are less certain; but those of Athanasius[4] frequently name the apostle James in full, and quote his very words.

332. The epistle was held to be authentic and Divine by all those who attributed it to the apostle James, the son of Alpheus. But as to those of the ancients who believed it to be not by the apostle James, but *by James the Just, the brother of Jesus Christ*—and would make two different persons of these two Jameses—it left them in some doubt, not of its authenticity, but its canonicity; because they supposed that the author, notwithstanding his eminence, was not an apostle.

Yet, at the beginning of the fourth century, these doubts came to an end; and the majority of the churches were unanimous in favour of inserting it in the canon. We have seen that all the eleven catalogues of the same century equally admit it, (Prop. 56.)

333. Origen held it to be Divine, as we learn directly from many of his quotations. For example, in his commentary on John,[5] on the Epistle to the Romans, and on the 30th Psalm; and in his eighth homily on Joshua, (which has come down to us only in a Latin translation.)[6] And if Eusebius, in the citations he has made of the opinions of Origen respecting the Scriptures, appears to us as representing him to be silent on the Epistle of James, we must not draw any unfavourable conclusion from this circumstance; for the same author, (*Hist. Eccl.*, vi., 25,) speaking of the opinions of Origen on the canon, has abstained from saying anything on the Epistle of Jude, though Origen has quoted it more than fifteen times, and with eulogy.

Eusebius, as we have seen, puts the Epistle of James in the

[1] Particularly Mandat., ii., ix., xi., xii., 5, 6, where the author cites James iv. 7, 12; Simil., v., 4, viii., 6.

[2] Especially Hæres., iv., 16, § 2.

[3] De Orat., viii.; Adv. Jud., 2.

[4] Ad Serap., Ep. i.; Contra Arian, ov. 3.

[5] Tom. xix. Opp., tom. iv., p. 306. Ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν. Neudecker translates φερομένῃ, in this passage, "universally acknowledged." Others translate it, "which is put in circulation." See likewise in Ep. ad Rom., lib. iv. Opp., tom. iv., pp. 535, 536.

[6] Opp., xii., p. 412. "Petrus," he says, "duabus epistolarum personat tubis, Jacobus quoque et Judas."

rank of writings that are still controverted, though acknowledged, he says, by a great number, (*Hist. Eccl.*., iii., 25.)

Even Amphilochius, in speaking of the doubts which some have had in reference to the five small later epistles, excepts the Epistle of James, which, he says, is "received by those who doubt the four others." It is useless to point out the testimonies of the following centuries, for the canon was henceforward definitively fixed.

334. Many authors have noticed that the First Epistle of Peter, which was written later than that of James, contains more than ten sentences[1] relating to morals or doctrine, which, by their striking resemblance to passages in the latter, bear a silent testimony to it; the Holy Spirit not being able better to attest its divinity than by adopting and incorporating these sentences in an epistle so readily and constantly received by the whole Christian world.

335. Some persons have too often taken pleasure in recalling a most painful expression of Martin Luther in 1522, respecting the Epistle of James, which, without sufficient reasons, at first appeared to contradict the doctrine of the Scriptures on the justification of the sinner by faith. But, besides that this great servant of God afterwards retracted that imprudent saying,[2] it must not be forgotten that at the time when he uttered it, innumerable frauds had been practised everywhere in almost all the monuments of Christian antiquity—false titles, false scriptures, false books of the fathers, false legends of the Breviary, false decretals of the popes. In his time men's minds were beginning to emerge from this chaos; and even in the Roman Church the eyes of some were opened at last to many of these falsehoods. Still it was not yet easy to distinguish in every instance the real from the supposed monuments, to recognise the true principles of sacred criticism, nor to consult the materials for it, many of which

[1] For example, James iv. 2, and 1 Pet. v. 5, quoted by Clement of Rome, (ch. xx.) So James i. 5, and 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, quoted by the same father, (ch. xxxiii.)

[2] In all the editions of his Bible posterior to 1526. See Gerhard, Theologia Locus de Script. Sacra, § 279, (Frankfort, 1657;) Seckendorf, Commentar. de Lutheranismo, (Frankfort, 1692;) Calovius, Biblia Illustrata, (Frankfort, 1676, fol.,) tom. xi., p. 1393.

were yet to be discovered.[1] Critical learning was confined to the assertions of Eusebius, and it was not yet known how to sift them. It was not yet certain that the Roman Church, already so strongly impelled to throw apocryphal books into the depository of the Old Testament, (which had been intrusted only to the Jews,) would not in the same way make free with the New, to foist also into it uninspired books; for it was not sufficiently understood that the providence of God is pledged, as we shall presently shew, never to allow this unfaithfulness to any church, good or bad.

Section Sixth.

ITS EXCELLENCE.

336. If it entered into our plan to take account of the spiritual beauty and sublimity of the books of which we here establish the canonicity by historic proofs, we should be led to remark the original, profound, and pathetic character of this sacred epistle, its perfect adaptation to the wants of the primitive Church as it existed among the converts of the Israelitish population, the elevation of thought, the majesty of its style, and its noble simplicity. Above all, we should display its incomparable superiority, when compared with the uninspired writings of those first ages. While the latter present so many trivialities, oddities, and extravagances, here there is nothing of the sort; all is sober, wise, grave, and elevated. And there is great force in this negative proof. It manifests the operation of the Holy Spirit with the same clearness with which we have been struck on attempting to compare the apocryphal Gospels with the canonical.

Section Seventh.

WHICH JAMES IS ITS AUTHOR?

337. If many writers among the ancients, and many especially among the moderns, have appeared to attach great importance to the resolution of this question, "Was this James an apostle, or

[1] For example, the Epistle of Clement of Rome, which renders an important testimony to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and to the Epistle of James, was not discovered till 1628.

was he not?" yet all acknowledge that he was a brother of Jesus Christ; that he governed the church at Jerusalem for seven-and-twenty years; that he held the highest place among the apostles, of whom he was one of the three pillars, and the first of the three; that, in one word, he was that James so often mentioned by Luke in the Acts,[1] and by Paul in his epistles.[2] But this is not the question. The author of this epistle, was he, or was he not, one of the twelve? This is the point that has been so violently disputed. Was he the same as the apostle James the Less, the son, according to some, of Alpheus and Mary, the wife of Cleopas, the aunt of Jesus Christ; or, according to others, of Alpheus and of that Mary, the mother of James and Joses, who stood beside the cross?[3] Or rather, was he a third James, not known to the readers of the New Testament before the 12th chapter of Acts? In other words, was he styled *brother of the Lord* in virtue of being only a first cousin, or as a half-brother? Was he really one of the twelve?

338. If many persons, whether in impugning or defending the canonicity of this epistle, have attached so much importance to this question of the apostolicity of its author, we believe this view to be erroneous. And when, in the present day, the rationalists, to weaken the inspiration of the Scriptures, have done their utmost

[1] See Acts ix. 26–30, xii. 17, xv. 13–20, xxi. 18–25.

[2] See Gal. i. 17–19, ii. 2, 6, 9, 12; 1 Cor. ix. 5, xv. 7.

[3] For example, according to Kirchhofer, (p. 258,) who appears to believe that he was the son of Alpheus and of Mary, the mother of Jesus, by a second marriage, and identifies the latter with the Mary of whom we speak, (the mother of James and of Joses.)

We read in the Gospel of John, (xix. 25,) that the blessed mother of Jesus had a sister, named Mary (the wife) of Cleopas; and we learn that these two Maries, on the awful day of the crucifixion, met together at the cross with a third Mary, called *of Magdala*, (or Mary Magdalene.) Here is the question:—Where are these three Maries in the parallel accounts of the crucifixion in the evangelists? Where is the blessed mother of the Saviour? Have the three other evangelists forgotten her? This does not seem admissible. "Many women were there," they tell us, (Matt. xxvii. 55,) "beholding afar off, . . . among which was *Mary Magdalene*, and *Mary the mother of James the Less, (son of Alpheus*, Matt. x. 3,) *and of Joses*, and the mother of Zebedee's children, and Salome," (Mark xv. 40.) Can we believe that the three first evangelists neglected to name in this scene of Calvary the mother of the Saviour? and must we not rather think that this Mary, the mother of James the Less, of Joses, and of Jude, (brother of James, Acts i. 13, Jude, 1,) was this same mother of Jesus whom we find so often in the Gospels

to prove that neither James, now under our consideration, nor Jude his brother, author of the epistle which bears his name, nor the John of the short epistles, nor the John of the Apocalypse, nor the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, nor even the Matthew of the first Gospel, were in the number of the twelve apostles, we think that their assertions, otherwise ill-founded as to the matter of fact, have very slight bearing on the argument.

In fact, inspiration was by no means confined to the apostolate. Many others besides the twelve received miraculous gifts, and among those gifts, that of inspiration. A writing was canonical, not because it was apostolic, but because it was inspired. The Gospel of Luke, that of Mark, and the Book of Acts, had, in virtue of being inspired scriptures, the same authority as the Gospels of Matthew or John,—God having chosen, according to His good pleasure, among the twelve and out of their circle, men whom He made the prophets of His New Testament, just as He selected from different stations in life a Solomon, an Amos, a Joel, or a Nehemiah, to make them the writers of His earlier oracles. For a book to have Divine authority, it was sufficient that it was inspired; and it was sufficient to prove a book to be inspired, that it was recognised as canonical, that it was recommended as such to the primitive churches by the apostles of the Lord, and that it

accompanied by the brethren of Jesus, (James and Joses, Jude and Simon, Mark vii. 3; Matt. xii. 46, xxvii. 55; Luke viii. 19;) and whom we see again on the day of the ascension, (when she was at least sixty years old,) accompanied still by *the brethren of Jesus*, in the upper chamber at Jerusalem? (Acts i. 13.)

We believe that the Bible has always honoured the condition of *a mother in Israel*, quite as much, at least, as that of a virgin. "Mary," it is written, (Matt. i. 18,) "was espoused to Joseph; before they came together, (πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς,) she was found with child of the Holy Ghost, . . and Joseph knew her not *till* (ἕως οὗ) *she had brought forth her first-born son*," (ver. 25.)

All ages will call her "*blessed;*" but it must also be remarked, that the Holy Spirit has been so far from wishing to exalt the Son of man by the exaltation of His mother, that, on the contrary, He has been pleased to reveal to us all the humiliation of His birth, and that, in giving us His genealogy, He has taken care to name but four of His female ancestors in His whole parentage for forty-two generations. And these four females, who are they? First, the incestuous Tamar; then the unchaste Rahab; then Ruth the Moabitess; and, lastly, the unfortunate Bathsheba, who had been the wife of Uriah. The Holy Spirit does not teach us to speak of Mary but with honour; but, from the birth of *her first-born*, and through the whole course of the New Testament, He has never styled her the *Virgin*, as human traditions have done with so much zeal.

was received by them. This was accomplished under the direction of that providence of the Lord which has caused all our sacred books to be inserted in succession in the collection of His New Testament, as it has done for the Old, and which has made the whole of Christendom, both in the East and West, unanimous on this one point for fifteen centuries. This is the fact established by the history of the canon, and which we shall examine in the sequel.

339. Yet, without wishing to enter too far into this question of the apostolic character of James, to which we attach only a secondary importance, we believe that we can render it probable and almost certain, that the author of our epistle was no other than James the son of Alpheus, as he has been thought to be among the fathers, by Chrysostom, Athanasius, Jerome, Amphilochius, Augustin, Theodoret, Theophylact, and the Chronicle of Alexandria.[1] For—

(1.) It is without sufficient reason that, in order to deny the apostleship of James, it is alleged that the title of *apostle* is not placed at the head of his epistle; for neither has John put it at the head of his, nor Jude, nor even Paul in a third of his,[2] and yet all three were apostles.

(2.) After the death of James the Greater, (whom Herod killed in the year 44,) the Scriptures have always expressed themselves as knowing only one other James, the brother of the Lord, a man eminent in the Church of God. It follows that there could be no other person in the least distinguished of this name. What becomes of James the Less, if this eminent James was not he?

(3.) The Lord had four brothers, among whom are reckoned a *Jude* and a *James*, besides Joses and Simon, (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3.) But Jude calls himself the brother of James, (Jude 1,) and James is called, *the brother of the Lord*, (Gal.

[1] Thus have thought, in our day, Hug, De Wette, Guericke, and Reuss. Winer and Neander are not decided. On the other side, we find Origen, Eusebius, Hilary, Ambrose, Epiphanius, and Gregory of Nyssa. On such a question of criticism, the fathers are doctors, and not witnesses or judges; their authority is only that of the moderns.

[2] The first and second to the Thessalonians, that to the Philippians, to Philemon, and to the Hebrews.

i. 19.) It will be very naturally asked whether these are not t
same persons.

(4.) But, further, among the twelve we may reckon several
the *brethren of the Lord*, (1 Cor. ix. 5,)—among His brethren
James, a Joses, and a Jude; among the twelve, a James, the s
of Alpheus, and a Jude, brother of James,[1] who both were eitl
His brothers properly so called, or His first cousins,[2] or His ha
brothers. Must we not conclude that James, author of the epis
and brother of the Lord, (Gal. i. 19,) as well as Jude his broth
author of another epistle, have both been named, on the sa
grounds, *brethren of the Lord*, and both reckoned in the numl
of the apostles?

(5.) It would be very difficult to believe that the James of t
Acts, of the Epistle to the Corinthians, and of the Epistle to t
Galatians, if he had not been himself an apostle, would ha
enjoyed so high an authority in the presence of the apostles, eitl
in the Council of Jerusalem[3] or in his own house, where the eld
and apostles were convened, (Acts xx. 18,) or in Peter's estimati
(Acts xii. 17, Gal. ii. 12,) or in that of Paul, (1 Cor. ix. 5, G
i. 19, ii. 9, 12,)—"James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to
pillars," said Paul; "other of the apostles saw I none, save Jan
the Lord's brother."

(6.) It would be also very difficult, if he was not the apos
the son of Alpheus, to believe that the Book of Acts, in the 1
chapter, would abruptly introduce him on the apostolic scene
henceforward the most notable and influential personage of t
Church, without having said anything of his person or of
conversion, and without having made any mention of him el
where in the New Testament.

(7.) Above all, it will be very difficult to believe that Luke,
the moment just after he had been narrating the death of Jan

[1] Otherwise called Lebbeus or Thaddeus, (Acts i. 13; John xiv. 22; L
vi. 16.)

[2] Many object, not without reason, that it would be contrary to the usag
the Greeks to apply the term *brother* (ἀδελφός) to cousins. They add, that P
and Luke himself, when they wish to speak of cousins, make use of the te
ἀνεψιός or συγγενής, (Luke i. 36, 58; Col. iv. 10; Rom. ix. 5, xvi. 7, 11, 21.)

[3] Acts xv. 19—Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω. What would the doctors of the Church
Rome say, if Peter had used such language?

the Great, when his readers would be supposed to know no other James besides him, excepting James the Less, would immediately proceed to speak in the same chapter of a third James, of whom Scripture had hitherto said nothing, without giving notice that he was not referring to the only James whom his readers would be supposed to know.

(8.) But it would, again, be very difficult to believe that Paul would clearly and positively call him an *apostle*, (Gal. i. 19,) if he had not been one,—"I went up to see Peter, . . . but other of the apostles saw I none, save (or unless) James the Lord's brother."

In vain would any one attempt to do violence to this verse by translating it, "I saw none other of the apostles, but I saw James;" for not an example can be found of ἕτερον οὐκ being followed by εἰ μή in the restricted sense of *but*. And, besides, in this passage, was it not Paul's aim to establish that he had remained a long time after his conversion without *having seen an apostle?*—then James the brother of the Lord was an apostle.

(9.) When Paul says to the Corinthians, (ix. 5,) "Have we not power . . . as well as other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" it is sufficiently clear that he was far from meaning to except the brethren of the Lord from the number of the apostles. It puts them, on the contrary, in their rank with Cephas, as if he had said, "as the other apostles, even the brethren of the Lord, and even Cephas."

(10.) On the contrary hypothesis, there would be in the gospel history two persons named Joses, three named Jude, and four named James, which it is difficult to admit. Two called Joses, one the brother of Jesus, (Matt. xiii. 35,) the other His cousin or half-brother. Three called Jude—one Iscariot, the other a brother of Jesus Christ, (Matt. xiii. 55,) and another an apostle and son of an unknown James,—for we must then necessarily understand the expressions, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, (Luke xvi. 16, Acts i. 13, John xiv. 22,) in the sense of Jude *son* of James. And, lastly, four persons called James—first, the son of Zebedee; secondly, the son of Alpheus, and cousin or half-brother of the Lord; thirdly, His own brother; and, lastly, an unknown James, father of the apostle Jude.

340. We must come to the conclusion, that if it is by no means necessary to establish the apostolicity of this epistle in order to prove its canonicity, yet we have the strongest reasons for admitting that the author was an apostle; while persons of a contrary opinion are at least unable to prove that he was not.

CHAPTER III.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

SECTION FIRST.

THE STUDY WHICH IT CLAIMS.

341. THIS scripture claims more than any other an attentive study of its characteristics and its history; for, notwithstanding the beauty of doctrine and the apostolic majesty which distinguish it, it is, of the five controverted epistles, that which modern adversaries have most vigorously attacked, not only on account of what is deficient in its historic proofs, but especially on account of the homage that it pays so decidedly to the epistles of Paul, under the double relation of their authenticity and their inspiration.

Moreover, it must be granted that in all times men of learning have given their verdict in favour of it and against it. *Against* it, because, of the five *antilegomena*, it is that which presents in its favour the fewest testimonies of the fathers during the two first centuries of the Church; and *for* it, because, at the same time, of the five *antilegomena*, it is that of which the internal characteristics attest most undeniably its apostolic authenticity, so that, when persons are disposed to reject it, they are obliged to do it on suppositions so strange that they amount to a "moral impossibility," (as Louis Bonnet has so well said, in his Commentary on the New Testament,)[1]—"an impossibility (he adds) which, in every unprejudiced judge, produces a conviction so vivid and so firm, that we do not hesitate to assert that, among all the

[1] Nouveau Testament, dans son Introduction, tom. ii., Genève, 1852, p. 701.

books of the New Testament which have been controverted at certain times, there is not one whose authenticity is so certain as the Second Epistle of Peter."

This has latterly been the opinion of many of the most distinguished critics of Germany;[1] and we have very recently seen the learned Guericke, who, in his *Beiträge*, (p. 175,) had formerly expressed his doubts of its authenticity, nobly and repeatedly retract those doubts in his "Introduction" of 1854.[2]

Section Second.

THE EPISTLE AFFIRMS THAT IT WAS WRITTEN BY PETER.

342. It must first of all be well observed that the author declares himself to be "*a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ*," just as the author of the preceding epistle calls himself "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ." He repeats this assertion from one end to the other, directly and indirectly, and under all forms. He attests also that it is written to the same class of persons to whom the first had been addressed, that is to say, "*to the elect* among the Israelites *of the dispersion*, (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς,)" scattered as strangers through the different provinces of Asia Minor. "This second epistle, beloved," he says, "I now write unto you," (iii. 1;) and he avers that he was one of the eye-witnesses of the Lord's transfiguration on the holy mountain, when "there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." He says, moreover, that "the time of his departure is at hand," the moment had arrived for "putting off his tabernacle," (i. 13,) as the Lord Jesus Christ himself "had shewn him,"—(14)—that same Jesus who, a little after He had risen from the dead, had pointed out by what death he should glorify God, (John xxi. 14, 19.) He thought it "meet in both epistles," he adds, "to stir up the pure minds" of his brethren of the dispersion, by way of remembrance. He foresees that his letter will be universally read, and, in the expectation

[1] Besides Guericke, Isagogik, 1854; Dietlein, Der 2 Brief Petri, 1851, pp. 1-74; Thiersch, (1852,) Versammlung, &c.

[2] Page 483—"Der ich hiemit wiederholt retractire." See his Gesammtgeschichte des N T.; oder, Neutestamentliche Isagogik, p. 472.

of his approaching end, he will "endeavour that, after his decease, they might have these things continually in their remembrance, and be established in the present truth," (i. 15, 12.) At the same time he pronounces a eulogium on "all the epistles of his beloved brother Paul." They were already all written, even including the Epistle to the Hebrews, (Heb. iii. 15, 16,) though Paul was not yet departed; for the two apostles were destined to die in the same year, and under the same persecution. Paul, he said, "had written according to the wisdom given unto him;" woe to those who "wrested" his words; it would be "to their own destruction." In a word, we here see the author addressing his brethren with all the elevation of an apostle, who knew he was on the point of giving up his life for his Master, and of appearing before Him. He exhorts them to "account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation," and to "prepare for the great day of His coming," "looking for" and "hasting" by their prayers "the coming of the day of God," when the heavens, being on fire, shall be "dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat;" yet, according to his promise, they were to expect "a new heaven and a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness," (iii. 13.)

Section Third.

THE MAJESTIC CHARACTER OF THIS EPISTLE STRONGLY CONFIRMS THIS TESTIMONY.

343. That this scripture was indeed the work of an inspired apostle is powerfully attested by its whole character—by the majesty of the thoughts, by the purity of its doctrines, and by their profound harmony with the whole assemblage of the divine communications. From the beginning to the end the epistle reveals one of the twelve at the termination of his labours. It breathes throughout the apostolic spirit—an authority in the language—a sober grandeur in the imagery—a controlled but tender and solemn earnestness in its warnings—a calm elevation, vigorous, and sometimes sublime, in its denunciations of the future. The day of Christ comes on in spite of delays; let them flee, then, the corruption which reigns in the world through lust; let them give all diligence to holiness of life; let the Church hold

itself ready, by a holy conversation, not to be consumed by fire with the world. What comprehensiveness and what awful particularity in his description of the last conflagration at the end of all things, —the earth and the heavens enveloped in flames—the elements melted and confounded in order that the new heavens and the new earth, the dwelling-place of righteousness, may emerge from this universal ruin! And with what power does he conduct us to his solemn conclusion:—"Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" "Ye therefore, beloved, beware lest ye fall from your own steadfastness; but grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "*In omnibus epistolae partibus,*" Calvin has said, "*spiritus Christi majestas se exerit.*"[1]

344. It must, then, be clearly understood, that to decide on calling into doubt the authenticity of this epistle, as many have done, involves not only giving the lie to all the historical traditions which have transmitted it to us as Peter's, but forces us to find, either in the epistle, or in the monuments of history, reasons strong enough to admit such bold suppositions as the following:—

It must, first of all, be imagined that a scripture so serious, so profoundly conformed to the analogy of faith, and so immensely superior, in all its characteristics, to all the uninspired productions of the same, and the following age, could be the work, we do not say of an ordinary, unknown man, but of a detestable forger, capable of heaping falsehood upon falsehood, and of carrying his blasphemy so far as to give himself out to be the author of the first epistle which the Holy Spirit had already dictated to the apostle St Peter, so far as to fabricate the counterfeit of a second epistle, and to introduce it as Divine into the churches of God.

It must be also admitted, that the author, having composed false prophecies, a new Balaam, a new Ananias lying to the Holy Spirit, presented them as received from on high; all the while exhorting men to holiness of life, and recalling, with rare pathos, the terrible judgments of God against the ancient false prophets, and announcing His terrible judgments to come against false teachers! (2 Pet. ii. 3.) "Their judgment lingereth not," he exclaims,

[1] Argumentum Epistolae, tom. vii., p. 248. Berolini, 1834.

"and their damnation slumbereth not!" More than this, he would even speak of his approaching end. He had been "shewn" it, he says, by Jesus Christ himself; and this thought had not aroused his conscience. He had beheld with his own eyes the transfiguration of Christ; he waits without fear for His speedy return; and dares to pronounce those memorable words—"We have not followed cunningly-devised fables in making known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ!!"

But, still further, it must be admitted that such a man had been, nevertheless, so superior to all the forgers who, in succession, dared to give the Church supposititious writings, that, while these have always betrayed themselves by confusion of ideas, by poverty of materials, and by servilely borrowing facts from the inspired books, and likewise by unlucky details and manifest errors, nothing of the sort appears in this epistle. Everything is great, true, holy, serious, harmonious. And, after an examination that has lasted eighteen centuries, it is manifestly impossible to find anything in it which does not agree with facts and with Scripture.

In the third chapter, you meet with sublime instructions on an important and quite novel subject, which, nevertheless, are entirely conformed to the harmony of the Christian faith.

It must, then, be supposed that this wretched pretender, capable of such blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, knew how to compose an epistle, which, by its unity, its unction, and all its other excellences, shews itself far superior to all other uninspired writings of the same century, (as its opponents admit,) like the Alps towering above the adjacent hillocks. And when we speak thus, we do not compare it only with the apocryphal writings, or the supposititious works of Barnabas and Hermas, and the spurious epistles of Ignatius, but even with those of a Polycarp or a Clement. For we are able to detect errors of fact or of doctrine even in these pious productions. In the Second Epistle of Peter there is nothing of the kind.

Lastly, another admission must be made. It must be acknowledged that this impostor had seized better than any of the ancient fathers the object and true meaning of the First Epistle of Peter. For, when you compare it attentively with the second, (this re-

mark is by Michaelis,) you will find their agreement such, that, if Peter himself was not the writer of both, you will be obliged to attribute to the impious forger of the second an understanding of the first, which the ancient fathers themselves do not appear to have attained.

In a word, good sense, history, logic, and conscience, equally revolt against the supposition which would make the second epistle the work of an impostor.

Section Fourth.

THE OBSTACLES TO ITS ACCEPTANCE.

345. Yet, no doubt, it will be asked, how it came to pass that this second epistle, so holy and so majestic, was at first received by only a part of the churches, and that others hesitated, a longer or shorter time, to introduce it into the inspired volume of the New Testament. This delay, we answer, may be explained by two reasons—the one internal, the other external. The internal, relating to style, is pointed out by Jerome. The external is supplied us by history. We shall speak first of the former.

Section Fifth.

ITS STYLE.

346. Jerome,[1] though regarding the epistle as canonical himself, tells us that the majority of those who, in the first ages, denied that it was Peter's, alleged, as a reason, the dissimilarity of its style to that of the apostle in the first, (*a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam.*) And even in the 120th of his letters, the father, for this reason, goes so far as to think that Peter made use of different interpreters to translate his two epistles into Greek, (*ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum, diversis eum usum interpretibus.*) But this objection, which also struck Calvin,[2] in the sixteenth century, and which

[1] Catal. Script. Eccles., cap. i.

[2] "I admire the Divine majesty of the Spirit of Christ in all parts of this epistle," he says; but yet, while acknowledging its apostolicity, he adopted Jerome's notion, that it proceeded from Peter, but that he had employed the

Salmasius[1] reproduced in the seventeenth, as many others have done in our day, is not, after all, of much weight. First of all, because a serious examination of the two epistles destroys it, by shewing that it is not founded on fact, as may be seen in Guericke's Introduction, (1854.) The two epistles, carefully compared, reveal, in fact, more points of agreement than of difference. And, besides, we may remark, in general, that nothing is more arbitrary or uncertain than such arguments founded on style; because the same author, according to subjects and circumstances, may, in this respect, greatly differ at one time from what he shews himself to be at another.

It is very true that Peter, in his second chapter, when he foretells to the churches the surreptitious intrusion of false teachers who denied their Redeemer, "who privily shall bring in damnable heresies; . . . . by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of," (ii. 1–3,) it is very true that Peter there rises above his ordinary style, and gives vent to his indignation in the energetic and figurative language of the ancient prophets. But this cannot be a legitimate objection against the authenticity of the book, as will be seen immediately, because it applies, after all, only to the second chapter; and we might with equal reason predict that the author of this portion is not the author of the first chapter, nor of the third; for we can maintain that, this portion excepted, the style is the same in the one epistle as in the other.

Section Sixth.

Its History.

347. There is, as we have said, another reason, purely historical, which explains to us why this second epistle was at first received only by a part of the churches. It is the state in which the apostle and the Jewish Christians of Asia found themselves at the period when it was addressed to them. When Peter wrote from Rome to the Jewish Christians of the dispersion, he was, as he

hand of one of his disciples. "Sic igitur constituo—a Petro fuisse profectam, non quod eam scripserit ipse, sed quod unus aliquis ex discipulis, ipsius mandato, complexus fuerit quae temporum necessitas exigebat."—*N. T. Comment.*, tom. vii., p 243. Berol., 1834.

[1] The opinion of Salmasius is reported in Wetstein, ii., 698.

said, at the point of "putting off his mortal tabernacle," and being offered up for Jesus Christ, as Jesus Christ himself had "shewed" him. This was in the year 65; so that this scripture reached the Israelitish Christians when Peter, already a martyr, was no longer among the living to give by his presence the same pledge for it which the first had; and when Paul also was no longer on earth to support by his testimony the scripture of his "beloved brother," (2 Pet. iii. 15.) The two apostles had just given up their lives for Jesus Christ, with a multitude of Christians who were sacrificed in Rome. The conflagration of the city by Nero took place on the 19th of July 64; and very soon after that frightful persecution began, so vividly described by Tacitus in the fifth book of his Annals: "At first those were seized who confessed themselves Christians, and then (on their deposition) an immense multitude, who were convicted less of the charge of incendiarism than of hatred to the human race. Covered with the skins of wild beasts, they were devoured by dogs; they were fastened to crosses, their bodies were covered with pitch, and then set on fire to serve as torches by night. Nero offered his own gardens for the spectacle," (*Ann.*, xv.) It was during these days of desolation that Paul and Peter disappeared from the Church militant, and that the second epistle of the latter, written so short a time before his death, (2 Pet. i. 14,) went from Rome to the East, in quest of the Israelitish believers. But in what state did it find them? In trouble and flight. On May 14, in the year 66, Floris, who for two years had reduced the people to the depths of despair, had begun, by the massacre in the market-place, that terrible and final war by which Jerusalem was soon to fall. The Jewish believers fled to the mountains. Menaced, pursued, wandering, they carried with them in their flight their sacred Scriptures, their Peshito version, which already contained, besides the four Gospels and the Acts, the Epistle of James, (written before the year 62,) the first of John, the first of Peter, and all Paul's epistles, it even comprised the Epistle to the Hebrews; but it could not, on account of the time, contain either the Apocalypse, written thirty years later, or the Epistle of Jude, or the two short ones of John, or even the Second Epistle of Peter. Scarcely had this arrived in the East from Rome when the news

of the bloody death of the two apostles soon followed it; and we can understand that, during these tempestuous days, the Christians would have little leisure to give to their mutual communications on this important subject sufficient time to insure unanimity. Hence we must expect to meet with the three following facts:— First, that the adoption of this second epistle would be *immediate* in some churches, especially among the Jewish Christians of the dispersion; secondly, that its successive admission into the other churches would be *slow;* and, thirdly, that its definitive acceptance throughout the Christian world would be *late.* All this actually came to pass; and this we shall proceed to demonstrate, beginning with the third fact.

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE DEFINITIVE ASSENT OF ALL THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES WAS LATE.

348. That this assent was late has been explained above in our 54th proposition, where we have shewn that it dates only from the Council of Nice, in 325. It was from this epoch, without any public deliberation on the point, or any decree, (Prop. 53,) but by the free action of the fraternal concurrence of so many eminent men, that this scripture, by a tacit, by universal consent, entered into the canon of all the churches both in the East and West. All those differences in regard to the *antilegomena* ceased in the main body of the churches at the close of the council, (Prop. 54.) All the eleven or twelve authentic catalogues of the fourth century that have come down to us (Prop. 56) alike contain it; that of Athanasius, (65;) that of Epiphanius, (68;) that of Jerome, (71;) that of Rufinus, (75;) that of Augustin, (77;) that of the forty-four bishops assembled at Carthage, (91;) that of Cyril, (59;) that of the Council of Laodicea, and of the bishops of all Asia Minor, (87;) that of Gregory of Nazianzus, (60;) that of Amphilochius, (61;) and that of Philastrius of Brescia, (62.) And we shall be able to name, in the same century, the celebrated Ephrem, the Syrian, who cites this Second Epistle of Peter in his Syriac and in his Greek writings;[1] also Didymus of Alexandria,

[1] See Guericke, Gesammtgesch. des N. T., p. 477. Leipsic, 1854.

his contemporary, who, in his principal work, *De Trinitate*, recovered in 1769, marks it as one of the Catholic Epistles, and attributes it expressly to Peter.

Section Eighth.

THE SUCCESSIVE ASSENT HAS BEEN SLOW.

349. In the second place, that the successive assent has been *slow* is equally shewn by the monuments of antiquity prior to the Council of Nice. For example, in 324—that is, only a year before the council was held—we hear Eusebius, in the third book of his history, giving us an account of the ancient pastors of the Church, (*τῶν πάλαι πρεσβυτέρων*;) and, according to them, putting this epistle in the number of the *antilegomena*, which, he says, were doubted by many, but were, at the same time, acknowledged by a great number, (*γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς*;)—acknowledged, he says elsewhere, by the majority of ecclesiastical authors, (*ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γιγνωσκομένας.*)

Again, in another passage in the third chapter of the same book, he says, "As to Peter, an epistle of his, which is called the *first*, is universally received," (*ἀνωμολογηται.*) Also, the ancient teachers, or pastors, (*οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι,*) have made frequent use of it in their writings, as an uncontroverted scripture, (*ὡς ἀναμφιλεκτῳ . . . . κατακέχρηνται.*) But as to that of his which is said to be the second, on the one hand, (*μέν,*) we have not yet learned (*παρειλήφαμεν*) whether it should be definitely inserted in the New Testament, (literally, *intestamentised*, *ἐνδιαθηκον*;) and, on the other hand, (*ὅμως δὲ,*) as it has appeared to a great number (*πολλοῖς*) to be useful, it has been the object of the same serious regard as the other scriptures, (*μετὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν.*)

Valesius[1] (Henri de Valois) translates this passage:—"*Studiose lectita est una cum reliquis Sacrae Scripturae libris*,"—"It has been carefully and habitually read with the other books of Sacred Scripture."

[1] In his edition of the ecclesiastical historians—Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, &c.

And as to those doubts of some, mentioned by Eusebius, Calvin[1] says they ought not to deter us from the use of this epistle; for Eusebius does not tell us who they were who doubted. "We owe them, therefore," he adds, "no more deference than to unknown persons; while Eusebius adds, that it was received everywhere without controversy." "*Quandoquidem a quibus mota sit haec quaestio subticet, non plus illis deferre necesse esset quam hominibus ignotis. Et postea subjicit passim sine controversiâ fuisse receptam.*"

We may clearly see, then, that, according to the opinion of Eusebius, the progressive assent given to this epistle, before the Council of Nice, had been *slow*, as we have said. As for himself, this father received it; and a great number of the churches were equally anxious (ἐσπουδάσθη) to add it to the anagnosis with the other scriptures. But, from all these facts, it cannot be concluded, says Eusebius, that it was decidedly made a part of the sacred volume. But this was effected in the following year.

350. The great Athanasius, already so celebrated at this very period, received it without hesitation. We find it cited many times in his writings; in his first Dialogue on the Trinity; in his second Discourse against the Arians; in the thirty-ninth epistle; in the Synopsis of Holy Scripture. "*The Second Epistle of Peter,*" he says, "has been so named by him who wrote it; for Peter, in order to instruct the Jews of the dispersion, who had been converted to Christianity, addressed this letter to them." "This," he writes again, "is what Peter said, (ὃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Πετρὸς,) —"*Thus to us have been given great and precious promises, that by them ye might become partakers of the Divine nature.*"

351. And if we go back a hundred years before Athanasius, as far as the learned and pious Origen, in the first half of the third century, we find abundant confirmation of the same fact, and in the most significant manner. This eminent man, born in 185, and so profoundly versed in the religious literature of the two first centuries, received our epistle, and often took pleasure in citing it as a portion of our sacred Scriptures, and as a second epistle of the apostle. He names it without any reservation, and even quotes several of the most noted passages in it, either in those of his

[1] In his Argumentum Epistolae, written in 1551.

Greek works which have come down to us, or in those of which we have only a Latin translation, as may be seen in his Greek Commentary[1] on Matthew, and (on two occasions) in his Greek Dialogue[2] "On the True Faith;" as also in the Latin version of his book "*On Principles,*"[3] (*περὶ ἀρχῶν*;) of his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans;[4] of his eighth homily, already cited, (Prop. 40,) on Joshua, on Leviticus,[5] on Numbers, and on Exodus.

And if we take care to distinguish here his Greek citations from the Latin, it is because the latter have been said to be less worthy of our confidence, on account of the liberties Rufinus, his translator, has taken with them. But Rufinus has done this only in certain writings, where he wished to conceal some mystical errors of Origen, and where there is no reference to the Second Epistle of Peter. Moreover, Origen, in the passages here noted, is not content with naming this epistle as Peter's; he quotes important sentences word for word, as may be seen in the notes. "*It is written,*" he says, "by Peter the apostle, '*According to the wisdom which has been given to my brother Paul, κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν, φησίν τὴν δεδομένην τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου Παύλῳ.*' It is written, he says again, (quoting 2 Pet. ii. 19, Homil. xii.,) '*Of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage.*' And Peter says, in his epistle, (*Et Petrus in epistolâ suâ dicit,*) '*Grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge of God.*' And Peter also says, (*Et item Petrus dicit,*) '*You are made partakers of the Divine nature.*' And the scripture, in one place,

[1] Opp., tom. ii., p. 55, tom. i., p. 323, tom. ii., pp. 164, 38; Kirchhofer, p. 281.

[2] He plainly indicates his knowledge of our epistle by saying, 'Ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἐπιστολῆς.

[3] Origen, Dial., Opp., tom. ii., p. 274, tom. i., p. 821, where, quoting 2 Pet. iii. 15, he says:—"It is written elsewhere by Peter the apostle, 'According to the wisdom given,' he says, 'to our brother Paul, (*πῃ δὲ ὑπὸ Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστολου γεγραμμένον.*)' And, again, citing 2 Pet. ii. 19, 'For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.'"

[4] Opp., tom. iv., p. 631. Edit. Bened., 1733–1759; De la Rue. And Peter says in his epistle, (2 Pet. i. 2,) "Grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge of God." (*Et Petrus in Epistolâ suâ dicit,* (2 Pet. i. 2,) "*Gratia vobis et pax multiplicetur in cognitione Dei.*")

[5] Homil. iv. in Levit., (Opp., ii., p. 200,) where he cites 2 Pet. i. 4, "Being made partakers of the Divine nature."

says, '*The dumb beast, speaking with a man's voice, forbade the madness of the prophet,*'" (Homil. xiii.)

It has been unfairly objected, that, in quoting in Greek the First Epistle of Peter, Origen simply calls it the catholic epistle, (*ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ,*) as if he only admitted one of them. This difficulty is reduced to nothing, when we see that elsewhere (in his Commentary on the Romans, i. 8) he uses absolutely the same terms to designate the Second Epistle of Peter, (*Et Petrus in epistolâ suâ dicit,*) "*Gratia*" . . . . &c., (2 Pet. i. 2.)

This great teacher, then, found, in his incessant study of Christian antiquities, satisfactory reasons for fully receiving this Second Epistle of Peter, though Origen says elsewhere (so at least he is reported to have said in Eusebius, vi. 25) that this epistle, though received by himself, was controverted by others. In a work now lost—an exposition of the Gospel of John—Origen, according to Eusebius, says, "Peter has left us one epistle which is universally acknowledged, (*ὁμολογουμένην*;) but let us admit a second, for it is controverted, (*ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γὰρ.*)"

Thus, then, from all the testimonies of Origen combined, including even the last, which yet does not seem entirely in accordance with the nine or ten other quotations from this father,—from all these combined testimonies we must infer that the general acceptance, according to Origen, of the Second Epistle of Peter, was *slow.*

Nor let any one be surprised here at the reserve of our tone of speaking in reference to this quotation from Eusebius; for this author betrays in the same chapter a great deficiency, either of exactness or impartiality, on the subject of the Epistle of Jude. In fact, while he professes to give an account of the opinions of Origen on the canon, he is able, notwithstanding the very numerous and manifest testimonies which Origen bears to Jude, to give us the canon of this father without making any mention of the Epistle of Jude.[1]

352. We can give still further confirmation to these conclusions taken from Origen, by another testimony, equally important, of the same century—that of *Firmilian.* In fact, if we can observe that, in Africa, Cyprian, at least in those of his works which have come

[1] See, further on, Prop. 385.

down to us, has made no use of the Second Epistle of Peter, (no more than Tertullian before him;) yet we see, by a letter to this holy bishop from the celebrated Firmilian, that, in the same period, our epistle was cited by this learned man, then bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, and very influential in Asia. He flourished in 231. He was a great friend of Origen, who even went to visit him in his distant diocese, and received in his turn a visit from him in Judea. He afterwards writes as follows to Cyprian:[1]—"The blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, have expressed, IN THEIR EPISTLES, their horror of heretics, (*in* EPISTOLIS SUIS *execrati sunt*,) and have warned us to avoid them." We cannot doubt that, in these expressions in reference to Peter, Firmilian had in view our second epistle, since the first does not say a word about heretics, while the other devotes a whole chapter to denouncing against them the terrible judgments of the Lord. The admission of the epistle, we repeat, was therefore *slow*, though real and progressive

353. And now, if, from the third century, we pass on to the second, and even to the first, still we find the same fact confirmed in the rare monuments of that period. We cannot speak here of the Catalogue of Muratori either on one side or the other, because, as we have seen, (Prop. 10,) that part of the manuscript which ought to mention Peter is wanting in the fragment. But, in the second century, we find, first of all, Irenæus,[2] who quotes twice the eighth verse of the third chapter. Peter, it is true, is not named; but the father gives his words—"For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years, (*Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη,*)" —and what proves it to be a quotation on his part is that Justin Martyr before him, when citing the same words, gives them as taken from Scripture—*Συνήκαμεν*, he says, *καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον*—we know also it has been said, *a day of the Lord is as a thousand years.*[3] Further, we may see, again, in this same century, by an important fact, how much this Second Epistle of Peter was then spread abroad and respected; for Clement of Alexandria wrote an exposition of it. We learn this fact from Eusebius and Photius; from Eusebius,

[1] In the Epistles of Cyprian, the 75th.

[2] Adv. Haeres., v., 23, 28.

[3] Dial. cum Tryph., p. 308, ed. Thirlbü; London, 1722. Tom. i., para. ii., p. 283, ed. Otto; Jena, 1847.

who tells us that Clement, in his *Hypotyposes*,[1] now lost, made abridged expositions of all the canonical scriptures; and also of Photius,[2] who mentions the commentary of Clement *on the epistles of the divine Paul, and on the catholic epistles*, (*τοῦ θείου Παύλου τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ τῶν καθολικῶν.*) But it is well known that Eusebius and Photius both placed the Second Epistle of Peter among those which they called *the Catholic Epistles*. "And as to what some have asserted," says Guericke,[3] "that Cassiodorus represented Clement as having commented only on the First Epistle of Peter, it is because they have not examined the words of that author."

Further, in the same second century, we can, with Lardner, cite Athenagoras, who, on two occasions, seems to allude to the words of our epistle, and Guericke, (*Introd.*, 1854,) who quotes for us a father more ancient than Irenæus—Theophilus, bishop of Antioch—in whom we find two passages sufficiently clear, referring to 2 Pet. i. 10 and i. 19. Besides, in the first century, we cannot help observing in the apostolic fathers numerous allusions, especially in Clement of Rome, as may be seen by referring to the long extract we have given in our Second Book, particularly in Chapters VII., IX., XI., XXIII., XXXIV. Many others might also be quoted from the *Shepherd of Hermas* and from the *Epistle of Barnabas;* but we have abstained hitherto from appealing to these two books. "No doubt," says Guericke, "persons may dispute these very palpable citations which we have pointed out in the apostolic fathers; but no impartial person can fail to perceive clear allusions to his second epistle."[4]

Yet all must admit that these quotations will have little weight with decided opponents, because Peter is not expressly named, and because they are not disposed to acknowledge more than accidental resemblances in the thought and language. Besides, it must be understood that, before a book was decidedly admitted

[1] Hist. Eccl., vi., 14. Πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐσπεσημειώσαι πεποίηται διηγήσεις. Valesius translates it, *compendiosam enarrationem.*

[2] Μυριοβίβλου, (Biblioth.,) cod. 109. Edit. Bekker, p. 89.

[3] In his last edition, p. 476. Gesammtgeschichte des N. T.; oder, Neutestamentliche Isagogik. Leipzig, 1854.

[4] Ibid., p. 472—"Doch jedem Unbefangenen unverkennbare Anspielungen." See also Dietlein, Der 2 Brief Petri; Berlin, 1851, p. 1–71.

into the canon, *entertainers*, as Eusebius says,) even those who received it abstained from citing it to others, or cited it with reserve. We prefer, therefore, to appeal to a more significant testimony, and, while concluding once more that the progress of the book among the churches taken collectively was *slow*, though real, we pass on to our third point.

Section Ninth.

The assent on the appearance of the book was immediate among a part of the churches.

354. We say, then, in the third place, that it results equally from the monuments of the first century that the adoption of Peter's epistle among a great part of the primitive churches, and especially among the Israelitish churches of the dispersion, was immediate. This important fact may be inferred from the unanimity which we have seen was so easily established among the churches of Christendom after these principal teachers, assembled from all parts of the ancient world, had met at Nice in their first general council. How could they have then decided with so much concord and firmness if they had not seen in the monuments of the primitive Church testimonies which are no longer within our reach? How, especially, a hundred years before, could the learned Origen, so jealous for the Scriptures, so versed in the knowledge of antiquities, and living so near the apostolic times, insert this letter in his canon if he had not had satisfactory proofs for it, and if he had not been able to trace it to the first times of Christianity?

Yet the proof, which after all is only a very powerful presumption, may appear still insufficient to the opponents of the epistle. We have another which seems to us unanswerable—it is the testimony of Jude.

355. Although it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit to communicate its Scriptures to the Church sufficiently late for them to be immediately confided to the guardianship of a Christian people already constituted, that is, to numerous churches already formed by the oral instructions of the apostles, and although the majority of the later received epistles were written very near the moment

when their authors disappeared by martyrdom, yet the same Spirit provided that the sacred writers should have time to confirm one another by the testimonies which they mutually bore. Thus, in the same way that Paul bore testimony to Luke, Luke to Paul, John to the three first evangelists, Paul and Peter to James, and Peter himself to "all Paul's epistles," (2 Pet. iii. 16,) so the apostle Jude, "a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James," in his *Catholic* Epistle, written after the two epistles of Peter, (as may be seen by various marks, &c., as we shall soon point out,) this apostle Jude evidently quotes words taken from the Second Epistle of Peter, while declaring, "that they had been *spoken before by one of the apostles of Jesus Christ,*" (ver. 17, 18,) and that the Christian Church ought to "*have them in remembrance.*" Let us, then, examine attentively both this citation of a passage in Peter and the testimony which Jude bears to it.

356. First of all, here is the citation from Jude[1]—"*But, beloved, remember ye the words* which were spoken before by THE APOSTLES of our Lord Jesus Christ." And what are *these words?* According to Jude they are the following:—"How that THEY TOLD YOU *there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.*" And where did they say this? Evidently in the Second Epistle of Peter, and nowhere else.

For if we search for these words in the New Testament, making use of the Greek text, we shall find them word for word in the third chapter and third verse of the Second Epistle of Peter, who, at the beginning of his letter, styles himself, "*Simon Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ;*" we shall find them there, and only there.

It is thus, then, that Jude quotes the Epistle of Peter as a scripture already known to the churches for some years, for he says to them, "*Remember ye.*"

And he quotes it as apostolic, for he says to them, "Remember ye the words which were spoken BEFORE of the APOSTLES of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Let us examine attentively the very words which Peter wrote,

[1] We have already commented on this passage in the last chapter of our Second Book.

(2 Pet. iii. 3.) "Knowing this first," he says, "that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts,"—ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν ΕΜΠΑΙΚΤΑΙ, κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι. And let us compare, word for word, these words of Peter with those of Jude, "The apostles have told you that in the last time (ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ)—this is like Peter's expression, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων—there shall be MOCKERS, (ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται,)—this is like Peter's ἐλεύσονται ἐμπαῖκται—walking (πορευόμενοι)—the same as Peter's πορευόμενοι—"after their own ungodly lusts, (κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀσεβειῶν,)"—this is like Peter's κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας.

And it deserves notice that the most important word of Jude, that of ἐμπαῖκται, (*mockers.*) occurs only once in all the writings of the New Testament, namely, in this single passage of the Second Epistle of Peter.

357. Let us add, that to render a still more ample homage to the Epistle of Peter, Jude, in his short chapter, which has only twenty-five verses, appears to cite Peter in *ten other passages*, (2 Pet. i. 2, ii. 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18.) And more than this, in his fourth verse he bears testimony to the accomplishment of the prophecy which Simon Peter had made in the first verses of his second chapter; for the one speaks of heresies, future but near at hand; while the other, writing much later, speaks of them as being already before his eyes.

358. This testimony of Jude in favour of Peter appears to us of irresistible force in establishing the high antiquity of the use the first Christians made of his epistle as an apostolic writing; for Jude cites it as a book *written aforetime*, and which he invites them to *remember*. And we ought not to forget that the proof drawn from this remarkable testimony does not depend on its inspiration, since it would be sufficient for our argument if Jude, instead of being an apostle, had been only a simple writer of the same age, whose words had come down to us. It is enough that his epistle should be acknowledged as an authentic and contemporary writing; but that it is both the one and the other, even the opponents of the Second Epistle of Peter are obliged to admit, for we shall soon shew by the most ancient of the Latin

fathers, (Tertullian,) and by those of the Greek fathers who have most weight in these matters, (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and others,) that the Epistle of Jude, which appears to have been written after the death of all the apostles excepting John, was already received in the second century by all the churches of the East and of the West. The Second Epistle of Peter must therefore have been still more ancient, and the numerous resemblances which the two scriptures present cannot serve to establish a prejudice against that of Peter, when once it is proved that it was the most ancient, and that Jude has quoted it.

359. We must then come to this conclusion with our third point, that is to say, with the fact, that among a great part of the churches, above all, among those of the circumcision, the admission of the Second Epistle of Peter was *immediate; slow* afterwards, and *progressive* among the other churches, it became at last *universal* from the first half of the fourth century.

This was the point to be established. We now proceed to the Epistles of John.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TWO SHORTER EPISTLES OF JOHN.

360. These two epistles contain, in all, only twenty-eight verses; but, though their Divine authority is abundantly testified by the most respectable witnesses of Christian antiquity, they were, among many persons, for a time, an object of doubt. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 25) has classed them, as we have said, among the *controverted* books, though acknowledged, at the same time, by a great number, (*τοῖς πολλοῖς*). He seems even to doubt whether they should be attributed to John the Evangelist or to some other author of the same name, (*εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου*.) He quotes, besides, (vi. 25) a passage from Origen, in a work now lost, where that father, while acknowledging himself these two epistles, has thus spoken of them:—"John, besides his Gospel, has written the Apocalypse; . . . . and he has left an epistle of a very small number of lines, (*στίχων*). To this a second and third epistle are added, though all do not say that they are genuine, (*οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας*.) But both together have not a hundred very short lines, (*πλὴν οὔκ εἰσι στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν*.)"

361. It is easy to give a satisfactory reason for the reluctance which many felt to admit these two short and late epistles into the canon. They were addressed to individuals; they were remarkably short; and the author never names himself otherwise than by his title of *elder*, (*ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, *the elder*, by eminence.) We shall return to this subject in the following chapter.

362. On the other hand, these two epistles, in their style and

thoughts, are so manifestly of the same parentage as the first of John, that we cannot attribute them to any other author. The first and the two last render mutual testimony by the numerous resemblances which the critics have taken pains to point out, and which may be studied in their works;[1] as well as other relations, quite worthy of notice, between these two short epistles and those of James and Peter.[2]

Besides, it may be asked, what end could a false St John have in forging them? What object could an impostor have in fabricating these two writings, so familiar, and, at the same time, so full of interest, as representing to us, to the very life, the intimate relations of the apostle and the churches? Neither of them advances any doctrines but those of John. They recommend no man, and no party in the Church; they do not insinuate, even in the most distant manner, the least of the errors which the heretics of the time were then sowing plentifully; they breathe only the holy unction and the tender love of John; they are simple and modest, like himself; in a word, they present all the most natural characteristics of reality and truth.

363. Also these two epistles, notwithstanding their extreme brevity, have had the best testimonies of authenticity.

First of all, in the East, from the second century, there is the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, to whom so much credit has been given in sacred criticism. He received them both as the divinely-inspired writings of the apostle John,[3] and even wrote commentaries on them.[4] Then, in the West, in the same century, there is the testimony of the Canon, attributed by many to Caius, a presbyter of Rome, and published, for the first time, by Muratori.[5] These are his words. He had before cited the First Epistle of John; and adds, "*Epistola sanè Judae et superscripti Joannis duae in catholica habentur.*" Our epistles have, besides, in their favour in the East and West, the suffrage of Irenæus. Though the first contains only thirteen verses, we find it quoted twice by this Father. It is well known how much weight his

[1] See, for example, Guericke, p. 497.

[2] See Wordsworth on the Canon, London, 1848, pp. 283–286.

[3] Stromata, ii., p. 389, ed. Sylburgius; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., vi., 14; Adumbrat, p. 1011, edit. Venet. [4] Guericke, Gesammtgesch. des N. T., pp. 474, 495.

[5] See Propp. 31, 191–196.

education in Asia, near Polycarp, and his long sojourn in the very places where John resided to his death, give to his testimony, when it relates to this apostle. But, in his first book, (chap. xvi. art. 3,) he quotes at length the 11th verse of the second epistle. "John," he says, "the disciple of the Lord, pronounces condemnation on such men. He forbids our saying to them, '*Joy be to you,* (χαίρειν;) *for he that saith to them, Joy be to you, is a partaker of their evil deeds.*'" And further on, in his third book, (chap. xviii.,) he says, "And His disciple, John, in the epistle of which I have just spoken, enjoins upon us to flee from them, when he says, '*for many deceivers,*'" &c., quoting at length the 7th and 8th verses of the Second Epistle of John.

Again: we can name, at the beginning of the third century, Origen, who acknowledged both epistles as canonical in his seventh Homily on Joshua, already quoted. He there enumerates the writings of the envoys of our heavenly Joshua, and compares them to the priests who bore the trumpets in the host of the son of Nun. "Peter," he says, "sounds the two clarions of his epistles; James also, and Jude; and John comes forth to sound the trumpet as loudly in his epistles and Apocalypse, (*Addit nihilominus atque et Joannes tubâ canere per epistolas suas et Apocalypsin.*)"

We are also able to name, in the same third century, Dionysius of Alexandria, who, in a passage also alledged by Eusebius, (vii., 25,) cites them as authentic, and attributed to John—"though John," he tells us, "writes anonymously, and designates himself in both epistles only as *the elder,* (ἀλλα ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται.)"

Lastly, we are able to add to all these testimonies those of Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Philastrius, Jerome, Rufinus, Cyril of Jerusalem, and St Augustin; the Council of Laodicea, the Council of Carthage, and, in a short time, of all Christendom.

CHAPTER V.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

SECTION FIRST.

364. THE canonicity of the Epistle of Jude is very strongly attested. And it may excite our wonder that a scripture so short, consisting only of a single chapter, of twenty-five verses, could furnish the ancient fathers with such frequent quotations. We shall point out the principal ones further on.

SECTION SECOND.

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

365. All antiquity is unanimous in recognising the author as the apostle Jude, (Luke vi. 16)—Jude, the brother, or half brother, or cousin, of Jesus Christ, and the brother also of that James the Less (ὁ μικρός) who was the son of Alpheus, and whose relationship to the Son of man has already been discussed in a preceding chapter. Not one voice has been raised among the ancients to attribute this epistle to any other Jude than the apostle; this is altogether a modern attempt. Tertullian,[1] Origen,[2] Athanasius, (*Epist. Festal,*) Epiphanius, (*Haeres.*, xxvi.,) Jerome,[3] and others, unanimously give the title of apostle to its author.

366. This Jude, the brother of James, who is called Jude of James by St Luke, (vi. 16; Acts i. 13,) Thaddeus by St Mark,

[1] De Cultu Faeminar., lib. i., cap. iv.
[2] Comm. in Ep. ad Rom., lib. iii., tom. iv., p. 510, (ed. Paris, 1733.)
[3] Comm. in Tit., 1; Ep. 2 ad Paulin.

Lebbeus by St Matthew, and who is not spoken of again but once (John xiv. 22) in the Gospels, was married, if we may believe Eusebius, like the other brothers of the Lord, (1 Cor. ix. 5,) and his two grandsons, resident in Palestine, were, in the year 95, brought before the Emperor Domitian, who intended to put them to death on account of their relationship to the Messiah. This prince, however, seeing them to be nothing more than common men, soon dismissed them with contempt. They were afterwards greatly honoured in the Church, either as the relations of Jesus Christ, or as the nephews of James and Simeon, or as witnesses of the truth, and they lived till after the death of their uncle Simeon, who was made bishop of Jerusalem in the place of St James. "The relations and disciples of the Lord," says Eusebius, (iii. 11, and iv. 22,) took part in this election, and it was done by common consent.

367. Notwithstanding all the testimonies of antiquity on this subject, we have seen in our day the same authors who, to weaken the authority of the Epistle of James, have exerted themselves to propagate doubts of its apostolicity, have made similar efforts to impugn that of our epistle. This opinion, which is altogether modern, appears to us, as we have already said in reference to James, to have no argumentative force as to the canonicity of this book, and we refer our readers to what we have said elsewhere, (Propp. 338, 359.) Were it established, which it cannot be, on the data of modern criticism, that our Jude was not one of the twelve apostles, (Luke vi. 16,) the important questions which relate to his epistle would be in no degree affected.

SECTION THIRD.

ITS DATE.

368. The Second Epistle of Peter, especially in the second chapter, presenting most striking resemblances of ideas, sentiments, and even expressions, to that of Jude, it is of importance to ascertain which of these two authors has borrowed from the other. To us it appears very evident that it is Jude. "It is not doubtful," observes also Michaelis,[1] "that, in relation to this

[1] Tom. iv., p. 387, (French translation.)

epistle, that of Peter is the original." We can soon satisfy ourselves, for the following reasons:—

369. (1.) Peter wrote his second epistle not long before his death, in 64 or 65; while Jude survived the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, as well as that of the two Jameses. Luke, in fact, narrates that of James the Greater, (Acts xii. 2,) and Josephus the historian that of James the Less, (*Antiq.*, xx., 8;) but neither the one nor the other has mentioned the death of Jude, which antiquity places much later.

(2.) Jude employs the words of Peter with amplifications, because a writer who quotes is naturally more prolix than his original, (see, for example, Jude 9 and 2 Pet. ii. 11; Jude 14, 15, and 2 Pet. ii. 9.)

(3.) Jude, when he speaks of *scoffers* who "walked" in his time "after their own ungodly lusts," does not content himself with citing textually the sentence from Peter containing that remarkable term, ἐμπαῖκται, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament; but yet he takes care to say that, in quoting it, he adduces *the words spoken before by the other apostles of the Lord*, (18.) He, therefore, is the writer who quotes, and Peter the writer whom he quotes.

(4.) When Peter wrote this sentence, he gave it in the form of a prediction, making use of the future tense. "There shall be false teachers among you," he said, (2 Pet. ii. 1;) "many shall follow them." "There shall come scoffers, walking after their own lusts." But, on the contrary, what does Jude do? Speaking long after, and seeing with his own eyes the fatal accomplishment of this prophecy of Peter, he cites it as realised in his time, and, in speaking of it, makes use, not, like Peter, of the future tense, but of the present and the past. "There are certain men crept in unawares who were before of old ordained to this condemnation," (ver. 4;) and, (ver. 17,) "Beloved, remember ye the words which *were spoken before* by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time;" and (ver. 19,) "These be they who separate themselves, (sensual,) who have only the soul, not having the spirit." The one predicted the evil, the other saw it with his own eyes; the one preceded, the other followed.

(5.) When Jude chose, at the beginning of his epistle, to style himself *Jude, the brother of James*, we see plainly it was to introduce himself to his readers, not by reminding them of a living person, but of one dead—a martyr whose memory was revered in all the churches of Christ, and whose name was dear even to the other Jews who, Josephus [1] tell us, regarded his being put to death as one of the causes of their ruin. The churches had admired his faithful ministry for thirty years at Jerusalem. It is, then, sufficiently evident that Jude wrote his letter after the death of James his brother.

(6.) We may observe, that in classing the epistles of the New Testament, the churches, from the beginning, chose to range their authors in the order of the dates when they were written, (though, at the same time, the respective books of each of these authors were classed according to their importance, rather than their date.)

Thus Paul, who began so early by his epistles to the Thessalonians, is placed first.[2] After him comes James, who died in 62; then Peter and his two epistles, of which the last was not written till on the approach of his death, about the year 65; then John, whose epistles follow those of Peter; then Jude, because he wrote last of all; then, finally, the Apocalypse, because it was not given till after all the epistles, at the end of the first century, or at the beginning of the second.

By this mark, then, Jude is posterior to Peter.

(7.) Neander, also, has thought that the expressions used by this apostle in verses 17 and 18 indicate a very late epoch, the end of the apostolic age—the time when all the apostles of Jesus, excepting John, must have ceased to live. "Remember!" exclaimed Jude,—"remember the *words which were spoken by the apostles*," &c.

[1] Antiq., xx., 8; and Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., xxiii., xxv.

[2] The three Uncial Manuscripts, A, B, C, and most of the cursive manuscripts, place the catholic epistles in the first rank. "Epistolae catholicae," says Tischendorf, (prolegomena to his edition of the Greek Testament, 1849,) "magno veterum testium consensu, eo exhibentur ordine quo Jacobus primus est, alter Petrus, Johannis tertius, quarto Judas."

Section Fourth.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE EPISTLE.

370. It has sometimes been objected, that the ancient Peshito version, which contains both the Epistle of James and that to the Hebrews, does not contain the Epistle of Jude. But the Peshito version, composed, as we have said, in the last half of the first century, or the earliest part of the second, could not contain either the Epistle of Jude, written, as Neander has said, at the close of the apostolic age, or the Apocalypse of John, otherwise so generally acknowledged in the early days which followed its first appearance. It is said that the Peshito is the only Syriac version in which the Epistle of Jude is not found, and that it is found in those that have been published since, and of which there are some very ancient.[1] However that may be, St Ephrem, the illustrious father of the Syrian church in the fourth century, cites it as canonical, and attributes it to Jude.

371. In the second place, it is objected that the address of the epistle, while naming the author, does not give him the title of apostle. But Jude had no more reason to give it himself at the head of his epistle, than Paul at the head of his epistles to the Philippians, to Philemon, to the Hebrews, and to the Thessalonians, in which he names himself simply, "*Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ.*" He had even less reason, since, by naming himself Jude the brother of James, he would make himself recognised at once by all the churches as that Jude whom the Gospel of Luke had already designated by the same name of Jude (brother) of James, (*Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.*) Would it not be abundantly evident that this title would suffice, especially at a time when all the Jewish people, as well as the Christians, were still so imbued with reverence for the memory of this "pillar of the Church,"—for his long ministry, for his eminent sanctity, and for his illustrious martyrdom? "*Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, and a brother of*

[1] We have not examined them ourselves. See the Syriac versions edited by Edward Pocock, (Vers. et Notæ ad 4 Epist. Syriacos, Petri 2, Johann. 2 et 3, Judæ unam. Leiden, 1670.) Reuss (Gesch. der Heil. Schr., 429) thinks that the four catholic epistles published by Pocock belong to the Philoxenian version.

James,"—what more would he want? A proclamation to the French people in 1820, signed Jerome Bonaparte, brother of Napoleon,—would it leave any doubt as to the identity of its author, because he had not added his title of King of Westphalia? James, bishop of Jerusalem, and brother of Jude, was as well known to all Christians in the year 100 as Napoleon to all Europeans in the year 1820.

372. In the third place, it is objected that the epistle borrows too largely from the Second Epistle of Peter to be inspired. But whether these borrowed passages are more or less numerous, we can shew, by examples taken from either Testament, that it was often allowed by the Holy Spirit for a sacred author to have recourse to some of the thoughts of a preceding book, in order to give them a new turn, and to make a new application of them.

Still, there is a final objection taken from the use of apocryphal books, on which greater stress is laid. Though it has not, in our eyes, more weight than the foregoing, yet it will require longer attention.

Section Fifth.

ALLEGED CITATIONS OF APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

373. It has been objected that on two occasions Jude has made mention of events not spoken of in the Bible, and of which he could have received information only through apocryphal books; the first time, (in ver. 9,) where he speaks of the dispute of the archangel Michael with Satan about the body of Moses; and the second time, (in ver. 14 and 15,) where he cites a prophecy of "Enoch, the seventh from Adam." These citations, it has been said, render the epistle fallible, and, consequently, interdict us from regarding it as canonical.

We mention here only these two passages, and say nothing of verses 6 and 7, though some have been disposed to see an allusion to the fable of the angels defiling themselves with the daughters of men; but this strange notion can only be maintained by applying to the angels the pronoun τούτοις, in the 6th verse, which evidently refers to Sodom and Gomorrah, the names of which in the Greek (which immediately precedes) are neuter plurals, (Matt. x. 15.)

But whatever may be the meaning of this last passage signifies little. It is said the other two are enough; and it is sufficiently evident, according to Origen and Clement of Alexandria, that Jude made use, in the first passage, of an apocryphal Jewish work, known to these two fathers, and entitled *The Ascension* or *Assumption of Moses*, (*Ἀνάβασις* or *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως*;) and for the second passage another apocryphal work, also known to these fathers, and having for its title, "*The Book of Enoch.*" "Is it possible for us to admit as canonical," says Michaelis, "a writing which contains apocryphal recitals?" "*Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est.*" Jerome had said before him, "*In eâ assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur.*" Neither Joshua nor Moses, say the opponents of the epistle, have ever spoken of the facts stated by St Jude; these facts, then, must be supposititious, and the epistle must be regarded as altogether human.

But this objection, we reply, absolutely wants a foundation; for it is made to rest on six suppositions, not less erroneous than arbitrary.

374. First of all, it is assumed that an inspired man cannot adduce a past event without having heard of it from some tradition, or having read it in some book. That is to say, the sacred historians of the New Testament are regarded simply as compilers or memorialists; and we are to suppose that Jude, in order to be able to speak to us of the dispute of the Archangel with Satan, or of the prophecy of Enoch, must necessarily have copied an uninspired book. As if the whole series of the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament did not shew us the sacred writers discoursing of past facts and of future events, of which they received the knowledge from God alone. It is forgotten that the apostles profess to be men endowed with miraculous powers, guided by the Holy Spirit, and assisted by Jesus Christ, who "worked with them," as St Mark has said, "and confirmed the word with signs following," (Mark xvi. 20.)

We ask, for example, in what apocryphal book did Moses read the creation of the heavens and the earth. In what book did he read the creation of light, of the continents, of the sun and stars, of plants and animals, and, lastly, of man, formed of the dust of the earth, and made in the image of God? In what book, again,

did he read the words of God to Satan after the fall? or the genealogies of the elect humanity from Adam to Noah, with all their proper names for two thousand years? In what book did he read the successive scenes of the deluge during the twelve months when, preserved alone of all the earth, Noah floated over the deep, all on earth having perished, from man to the beasts? In what apocryphal book did the sacred author of the Book of Kings learn what passed secretly in the royal chambers of the palace at Bethel between an unknown prince and his queen, when, on account of their sick child, they planned her going in disguise to Shiloh, (1 Kings xiv. 1–5;) or, again, between a queen and her husband, when she secretly promised him the vineyard of Naboth? (xxi. 4–7.) By what book was the author of the Book of Job made acquainted with the transactions of that day, when Satan came to present himself before Jehovah in the midst of the sons of God, and ask permission to touch that righteous man in his bone and his flesh? (Job i. 6–12, ii. 1–7.) And in what other book did Isaiah find the name of king Cyrus, and his whole career, two hundred years before his birth? (Isaiah xliv. 28, xlv. 1–7, xlvi. 8–11.)

But again, to leave the Old Testament where these examples abound, and to come to the New; how did Matthew, speaking of events that happened fifty years before, become apprised of the dream sent to the Magi on the night of their flight and return to the East? (Matt. ii. 12, 13.) How did he learn the three temptations of the Lord—the act of the Holy Spirit driving Him into the wilderness, the words of Jesus to Satan, and the coming of the angels who ministered to Jesus? (iv. 1–11.) How was he informed of the solitary prayers offered by Jesus in the night of Gethsemane, when, withdrawing from His three sleeping disciples, he "kneeled down," and "fell on His face," in an agony? (xxvi. 36–44.) How did he know that an angel, on the morning of the resurrection, before the arrival of the women, had rolled back the stone, and sat upon it? (xxviii. 2, 3.) How did he know the secret transaction between the high priest and the Roman soldiers? (xxviii. 11–13.)

We shall have to put questions exactly similar, and still more pressing, respecting St Mark. We shall ask how, not being

an apostle, nor personally cognisant of the facts he narrates, it came to pass that he is more copious and exact in details than any other evangelist? How did all these little circumstances come to his knowledge, which he is the only one to give—he who wrote so late, and as distant in place as in time?"[1] How is it that he seems to have had the events still under his eyes, with an interest, a colouring, a freshness of memory which even an eye-witness could scarcely attain, if he were only an ordinary man?[2] In what document, moreover, could he have learnt that Jesus, after His ascension, sat down at the right hand of God? (Mark xvi. 29.) And as to Luke, who was not an apostle—would it be from Paul, as some have said, that he received the knowledge of so many facts narrated by himself alone?—from Paul, who had no more than himself been a witness of the Saviour's life, and who had not taken Luke as his companion till the twentieth year of his ministry, (Acts xvi. 10,)—that is to say, at least forty-eight years after the events of the nativity recounted in his Gospel with so many details? In what document did Luke (or Paul, if you please) find the two poetical prophecies which Elizabeth had uttered, sixty years before, in her humble dwelling "in the hill country," and which no other evangelist has reported? In what document did he find the address of the angel to Zacharias; or that of the archangel to Mary; or the words of Simeon in the Temple; or those of the heavenly host at Bethlehem? And this unknown document, who had taken the pains to write it, and to preserve it in secret so long, during the infancy of Jesus, and the thirty-five years of his retirement in Nazareth, and the twenty-five first years of Paul's ministry? Who guarantees us the correctness of the words that Luke puts into the mouth of these holy persons and of these angels? Who guarantees it, unless the God of the Scriptures—unless Jesus Christ, "the God of the holy prophets," as St John

[1] As Lardner has already shewn, and as may be collected from various passages, among others, Mark xvi. 20.

[2] Any one will be struck with our remarks on the Gospel of Mark, if he will take the pains to read, with this view, the details which this evangelist alone has given us—among others, i. 20, 29, 33, 35, 37, 45; ii. 2; iii. 5–9, 11, 17, 20, 21; iv. 13, 23, 24, 26, 29, 34, 36, 38; v. 29, 30, 32, 40, 41, 42; vi. 13, 38, 40, 50, 52, 54, 56; vii. 2–4, 8, 13, 22, 24, 26–29, 34, 36, 38; viii. 7, 10, 14, 19, 22, 26; ix. 20, 21, 22–25, 33, 35, 37–49; x. 46–52; xi. 13, 16, 18, 20; xii. 34, 41; xiii. 3, 37; xiv. 40, 44, 51, 52, 58, 59, 68; xv. 7, 8, 21, 28, 29, 41, 44; xvi. 1, 3, 7–11, 14, 19.

calls Him, (Apoc. xxii. 6,)—Jesus Christ, who had caused those of the New Testament to speak, as well as those of the Old; and who had said to the Jewish people, "Behold, I send unto you prophets, ... and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city," (Matt. xxiii. 34,)—Jesus Christ, who "*worked with them*," as it is said in the last verse of Mark's Gospel? And if it be asked in what document was Luke informed of that invisible angel who came from heaven to Jesus to strengthen Him, and appeared to Him alone, or that other angel of the Lord, alike invisible, who smote Herod Agrippa, in the year 44, when, seated on his throne, before all the people of Cæsarea, he felt himself suddenly struck with excruciating pains,[1] —if it be asked who saw this angel, or what document informed Luke respecting him, it must be replied, the same document which told Peter of the secret lie of Ananias and Sapphira, and Agabus of the future famine in the reign of Claudius, (Acts v. 3, xi. 28,)—which told St John the origin of the eternal Word, and His presence with God before the world was—which told of the coming of the great apostasy, and of the man of sin—which told the author of the Apocalypse of the most distant future of the Church and of the world—which also told Jude of the dispute of the archangel, and the prophecy of Enoch. As Rudolph Stier has well said, in his Commentary on the Epistle of Jude, "The two objected passages are explained by the apocalyptical contents of this epistle."

It is, then, sufficiently manifest, that nothing can be conceived at once more antiscriptural and more illogical than to impugn the canonicity of a book for the sole reason that it narrates facts, the knowledge of which the author could only have received from God himself. This would be at once to ignore the inspiration which the Bible claims, and to take for granted the very point in question. If the book calls itself canonical, it calls itself inspired; and to deny its canonicity, solely on account of the revelations it professes to give us, is, in other words, to say, this book is not canonical because it is not canonical. This first supposition is, then, inadmissible; and, on this ground, the objection drawn

[1] Acts xii. 23; Josephus, Antiq. Jud., xix., 7.

from it loses all its value. But it rests, we have said, on other suppositions not less gratuitous, and not less erroneous. Here is the second:—

375. It supposes that an inspired author cannot bring forward a fact mentioned in any uninspired book, without thereby guaranteeing the whole book. This assumption is extravagant. The books of the New Testament report many facts already contained in the book of Maccabees, without professing on that account to bear testimony to it. St Paul quotes verses from Menander, Aratus, and Epimenides,[1] without designing to give any moral sanction to these pagan authors. And the same apostle, in the Second Epistle to Timothy, (iii. 8,) without professing to guarantee in so doing the Chaldee paraphrases, speaks of the magicians Jannes and Jambres, whose names, omitted by Moses, but preserved in the national histories or traditions, are found in Pliny,[2] only forty years after Paul, and are read in the Targum of Jonathan in his paraphrase of the first and seventh chapters of Exodus.[3] If, then, we admit for a moment that the book of *The Ascension of Moses*, and the pretended *Book of Enoch* had already mentioned before Jude the two facts of which the apostle speaks, it will not follow that he borrowed them from these books, nor that, in reporting them, he intended to give the least moral sanction to these two rhapsodies.

Those even of the fathers who believed these books to be anterior to Jude were very far from regarding them as on this account worthy of belief in every part. "It was possible," said Origen,[4] "that the apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, knew what they could take in such writings, and what they ought to reject."

The objection, then, wants support on this second ground.

376. But this is not all; for it assumes, in the third place, that

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 33; Acts xvii. 28; Titus ii. 12.

[2] Lib. xxx., cap. i. He names only Jannes and Jotape. See Winer, Realwörterbuch, art. *Jambres*.

[3] And on Num. xxii. 22, (Calmet's Dictionary, art. *Jannes*.) This learned man places Jonathan under Herod the Great, but Carpzov and Prideaux think that the author of this work was much later. See Keil, Einleitung ins A. Test, pp. 191, 192.

[4] Prologue of his Two Homilies on the Song of Songs. "Quid assumendum ex illis esset scripturis, quidoe refutandum."

the apostle (or, if you please, the Jew who professes to be Jude) would have admitted the apocryphal books as canonical. But this is what the Jews have never done, as we shall shew elsewhere in speaking of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament.[1]

377. Again, the objection assumes that Jude, the brother of James, (or, if you please, some Jew announcing himself to the churches as Jude,) would undertake to offer a Greek book to the faith of the Jewish Christians, relating to the mysteries of a time contemporaneous with Moses, or even with Enoch. Certainly, to admit such suppositions, a person must know very little of the opinions of the Jews of this period respecting the Greek historians, and, in particular, of what Josephus says about them. All the first and second chapters of his book against Apion is designed to shew that, of all writers, the Greeks are the least worthy of credence in what relates to the knowledge of antiquity. But the two apocryphal books which we are urged to regard as the authorities from which Jude has taken what he says of Enoch and Moses were Greek, and unknown to the Jews. No author that has come down to us ever speaks of them.[2]

378. But, in the fifth place, that which is most strange in the objection is that it assumes that Jude (or the contemporary Jew who gave himself out to the churches as Jude) could have publicly placed his confidence in two writings so contemptible as *The Ascension of Moses* and the pretended *Book of Enoch*, in order to impose the quotations from them on the faith of Christian churches.

As to *The Ascension of Moses*, it was a Greek book known to the ancient fathers, but now completely lost, and no one insists upon it.

But as to *The Book of Enoch*—another work also known to the ancient fathers[3]—(and long since lost as to its Greek text)—it is one of the most despicable relics of apocryphal antiquity. It had come down to us only in short fragments preserved by George

[1] Part II., Book II., Chap. II., 4, 5.

[2] Dr Lawrence believes that the Book of Enoch was composed by a Jew, but gives no proof of it. See Lücke, Einleitug in die Offenb., p. 11.

[3] Particularly Clement of Alexandria, (Adumbrat. in Ep. Jud.;) and Origen, (περὶ ἀρχῶν,) iii., 2; and Didymus, (Enarrat. in Ep. Jud.)

Syncellus,[1] (a Byzantine author of the eighth century,) when the celebrated traveller Bruce, at the end of the last century, brought from Abyssinia three copies which he had found there, translated into an Ethiopic dialect.[2]

"This work," says Sylvestre de Sacy, "is not worth the trouble of translating."[3] Such a confusion of ideas prevails that the editor has felt himself compelled to transpose whole paragraphs and chapters,[4] which does not make it any better. He was not obliged to give good sense to that which had it not, and ought not to have altered them.

"One finds in it," he adds, "absurd repetitions, a wearisome monotony, monstrous anachronisms, a striking incoherence, without speaking of a ridiculous system respecting the years and months, which imply the grossest ignorance on the part of the author, even for the times in which his book appeared."

"In a word," de Sacy says again, "it is difficult to find anything more ridiculous or wearisome than this *Book of Enoch*;—a singular book, full of fables and fictions. If sometimes we frown, we are more frequently tempted to smile, and we may well be astonished that this strange composition could obtain any credit in antiquity. This impression, which will be made on all who, like me, may have the courage to read the whole book, may suggest the inquiry whether additions made to the primitive text since the first ages of the Church have not rendered it more absurd than it was originally."

Such, then, is the book from which Jude, as some dare to affirm, has taken his citations!

379. But, more than this, and we hasten to say it, the whole objection falls to the ground, inasmuch as it rests entirely on a sixth supposition, still more worthless—on the pretended priority

[1] In his Chronogr. Scaliger was the first to make them known.

[2] One of the three is in the National Library of Paris.

[3] Dr Lawrence has translated it in England, (Oxford, 1821,) and Sylvestre de Sacy has given an account of the book in two articles in the *Journal des Savants*, (September and October 1822,) from which we have extracted his judgment.

[4] For example, six verses of the ninetieth chapter in the ninety-second; chaps. lx. and lxx. transferred to the end of the volume, on account of their gross anachronisms; the twentieth chapter placed between the sixteenth and the seventeenth of the original.

of these two writings to the Epistle of Jude, while this priority has for it only the opinion of some ancient fathers who were very often deceived on the question of forged books; while we have, on the contrary, the strongest reasons for holding both of these writings to be not only posterior to the epistle of the apostle, but fabricated with the express design of fraudulently corresponding with the words of Jude.

We know with what a multitude of forged writings, calling themselves apostolic or prophetic, the first ages of the Church were deluged. These awkward productions, these lying books, were imagined by a dishonest zeal among the degenerate Christians of Egypt and Asia to answer to some intimations of the sacred writers in their Gospels or epistles, and to represent certain books which were supposed to have been made or quoted by them.

Thus, for example, because Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, appeared[1] to refer to a former letter which he had written to the same church, an epistle was composed by some one, designed to pass for the lost one, but abundantly betraying its counterfeit quality.[2]

Because the same apostle recommends the Colossians (iv. 16) to read the epistle which "came to them from Laodicea," and which, according to all appearance, was no other than the Epistle to the Ephesians, (written at the same time, and intended to serve rather as a circular letter for the churches of Asia,) a writer has not been wanting to compose one, addressed to the Laodiceans, known in the days of Jerome, and of which this father says, "But it is rejected by all," (*Sed ab omnibus exploditur.*)[3] Because Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy, (iii. 8,) gives the names *Jannes and Jambres* to the magicians who opposed Moses, some one has been found to compose a book entitled, *Jannes and Jambres*, mentioned by Origen,[4] and put in the class of apocryphal books by Pope Gelasius.[5]

[1] We shall explain these facts in our Second Part, Propp. 427–432.

[2] Olshausen, Authenticity of the New Testament, chap. iv.

[3] In Catal., Erasmus calls it an epistle "quae nihil habet Pauli praeter vocul.s aliquot ex caeteris ejus epistolis mendicatas." [4] Tract. xxxv. in Matt.

[5] Yet this decree itself is held to be a forgery by the bishops. Cosin on the Canon, 123, 130; Pearson, Vind. Ignat., i., cap. iv.

Because Paul has said to the Galatians, (v. 6, vi. 15,) "*In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation,*" some one had composed an *Apocalypse of Moses*, from which, George Syncellus tells us, the passage of Paul had been taken.[1] Because the same apostle had said to the Corinthians, "Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard," &c., (1 Cor. ii. 9,) some one forged *an apocalypse of Elias*, from which the heretics, in the time of Jerome,[2] pretended that Paul had borrowed his language. "These words," Origen[3] had said, "are found only in the secret books of Elias."

It was in the same profane and lying spirit of the Greeks that about the same time were composed *the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, of which Origen[4] speaks, and of which Grabe, his editor, thinks that Tertullian has also spoken;[5] and *the Ascension of Isaiah*, which Dr Lawrence, in 1819, published in Ethiopic, with *the Book of Enoch;* and *the Acts of Peter and Paul, of Andrew, and of John, and of the other Apostles;* and *the Apocalypse of Peter, the Apocalypse of Paul, the Apocalypse of Thomas, the Preaching of Peter, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Gospel of Peter or of Matthew, the Homilies of Clement, the Doctrine of the Apostles*, &c.[6]

It was, let us say, in the same spirit, and almost at the same time, that *the Book of the Ascension of Moses* and *the Book of Enoch* were fabricated, or, at least, the tenth chapter of the latter, the whole of which consists only of the short words cited by Jude.

380. But there are other reasons which equally shew us in this book, or, at least, in its second chapter, a pious fraud, contrived to correspond with Jude.

(1.) First of all, we notice its extreme incoherence and evident marks of innumerable interpolations; so that all critics who have studied it, not excepting Dr Lawrence, (who, having edited it,

[1] Page 27, edit. of Paris, fol. 1652.

[2] Calmet (Dictionary) on the word *Apocalypse*.

[3] Homil. ultim. in Matt. xxvii. 9.

[4] In Jos., i., homil. 15. [5] Spicilegium, i., 133.

[6] A catalogue *raisonné* of all these spurious writings is to be found in the two works of John Albert Fabricius, entitled, "Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteus Testamenti," and "Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti."

would naturally speak with most favour of it,) are obliged to declare that it was written at different times, and by different persons.

(2.) The place so awkwardly given to the passage of Jude in a book which has 105 chapters. This passage, as we have said, forms by itself alone the second chapter; a fact which clearly enough betrays its late origin and intention.

(3.) There is the prophecy of the seventy shepherds,[1] where the author alludes to the rulers of the Jewish nation, down to Herod the Great. The book could not be more ancient than that reign, but it might be much later. And since it has manifestly received numerous interpolations, these must be still more recent; and the second chapter may be regarded as posterior to Jude.

(4.) There are various passages which, according to Silvestre de Sacy, betray "a Christian hand," particularly in the 19th and last section, (chap. 92.) Tertullian also tells us that the contemporary Jews rejected this book because it spoke too much in favour of Jesus Christ.[2]

(5.) Lastly, by the concurrent tone of a great number of passages, we may be assured that the forger was acquainted with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.[3]

Section Sixth.

TESTIMONIES OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

381. The Epistle of Jude is abundantly recommended to us by the most respectable witnesses of Christian antiquity.

Though it contains only twenty-five verses, and was not written till towards the end of the first century, or the beginning of the second, yet we find it frequently cited in the same century, both in the East and West.

It is recommended not only by allusions to its text which are disputable, such as are pointed out by Kirchhofer,[4] and by Lardner in Hermas, (Vis., iv., 3,) in Clement of Rome, (1 Cor. xi.,) in

[1] In chaps. lxxxviii.-xc. (*Journal des Savants*, p. 549.)

[2] See Calmet's Dictionary, art. *Enoch*.

[3] See especially chap. xlviii., ver. 2, 3, 5. (*Journal des Savants*, Sept. 1822, p. 551.)

[4] Quellensammlung, &c., 1842.

Polycarp, (ad Phil. ii. and iii.,) in the salutation which precedes the narrative of the martyrdom of Polycarp, in Theophilus of Antioch, and in Irenæus.[1] But it is especially recommended by the most precise quotations of the two fathers, whose testimony is the most valued in sacred criticism—Clement of Alexandria in the East, and Tertullian in the West. It is also in the canon of Muratori.

382. As for Clement of Alexandria, he not only mentions him by name, but quotes entire the 5th, 6th, and 11th verses in his *Paedagogue*, (iii. 8,) and gives the intermediate verses (7, 8, 9, and 10) in an abridged form. He names him also when he quotes the 22d and 23d verses, in the sixth book of his *Stromata*, (vi., 3,) and the 1st verse in his *Adumbrationes* on the Catholic Epistles.[2]

383. As to Tertullian, we find him speaking thus in his book, *De Cultu Faeminarum*, (i. 3,) "*Et accidit quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet*,"—"And it happens that Enoch receives a testimony from the apostle Jude." This citation, made by the most ancient of the Latin fathers, is of great importance; for it is most worthy of notice, that our epistle, notwithstanding its great brevity and comparatively late epoch, had already reached the distant churches of Western Africa, so as to be generally known and publicly cited as an epistle of the *apostle* Jude.

As to the canon of Muratori, we have already quoted these words, (Prop. 197:)—"*Epistola sane Judae et (superscripti) Johannis duae in catholica habentur*,"—"The Epistle of Jude and the two Epistles of John, which we have already mentioned, are numbered among the catholic scriptures."

384. We shall understand the full value of these testimonies, if we call to mind what we have said (Propp. 337–340, 354–359) of James, the brother of Jude, and of Simon, his other brother, who succeeded him, and did not suffer martyrdom till the year 107. If the Epistle of Jude was so well known to the fathers of the same second century, both in the East and in the extreme parts of the West, it must have circulated from church to church during

[1] Haeres., iv., 70, p. 371. Oxon., 1702.
[2] Believed to be a translation by Cassiodorus.

the lifetime of Simeon. How, in fact, could a letter, bearing the name of *Jude, brother of James*, have obtained such credit, if it had not had the assent of that apostle and of Simeon, and if it had not been really written by their brother?

We recollect what Hegesippus, a Jewish historian of the second century,[1] has told us of the grandsons of Jude. This holy family, devoted for three generations to the public service of the primitive churches of the central East, ought then to serve as confirmatory of the testimony of Jude.

SECTION SEVENTH.

TESTIMONIES OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

383. The third century equally renders full homage to this epistle in the writings of the most learned of its teachers. Origen cites it very often. He calls it a *divine writing*, and its author an *apostle*. He quotes the 8th and 9th verses in his epistles; the 6th verse once, at least, in his *Fourth Homily on Ezekiel*, and three times in his *Commentary on Matthew*, and again in his *Commentary on John*, and *on the Epistle to the Romans;* the 1st verse in his *Commentary on Matthew*. "*Petrus duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis*, (he says in his Sixth Homily on Joshua,) *Jacobus quoque et Judas*,"—"Peter sounds the trumpet in his two epistles, as well as James and Jude."[2]

"Jude," he says again, in his Commentary on Matthew,[3] "has written an epistle, of a small number of verses, (ὀλιγόστιχον μέν,) indeed, but full of powerful words of heavenly grace, (ἐρρωμένων λόγων.)

And, in the third book of his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, he says, quoting at length the 6th verse of Jude, *Et nisi hac lege tenerentur nunquam, de eis diceret*, SCRIPTURA DIVINA; "*Angelos quoque qui*," &c.

It is painful that Eusebius, after so many and such striking testimonies, should have given us the canon of this father (in his

[1] Quoted by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 19, 20. See Prop. 366.

[2] Translated, as we have said, by Rufinus, and come down to us only in this translation.

[3] Opp., tom. iii., p. 463, ed. Delarue, Paris, 1733; Huet, tom. i., p. 233.

6th book, chap. 25) without making any mention of the Epistle of Jude. This courtly bishop, whose history has otherwise so much value, must be read on certain points with some caution. Lax as he was on points of holy doctrine, he was so sometimes in his estimates of the Scriptures.

We find, in the same third century, the 6th verse of our epistle cited as to the sense, if not as to the precise terms, by *Pamphilus* of Berytus, in his *Apology for Origen*.[1]

We also find the 14th and 15th verses cited by Cyprian, or rather by one of his contemporaries, in a treatise to Novatian,[2] which is included in the collection of his works.

Section Eighth.

TESTIMONIES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

386. The testimonies of the fourth century are remarkably abundant both in the East and West.

In the East, *Athanasius*, in his *Festive Epistle*, and in his *Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae; Ephrem*, the Syrian, in his *Commentary on the 3d Chapter of Genesis*, and in his *Treatise on Unchastity*, where he quotes our epistle at length;[3] *Cyril of Jerusalem*, in his *Catecheses; Chrysostom*, in his discourse on *the False Prophets; Epiphanius*, in his book *against Heresies; Gregory of Nazianzus; Didymus of Alexandria;* the false *Dionysius, the Areopagite;* and *the Council of Laodicea*, (in its 60th canon.) In the West, *Lucifer* of Cagliari, *Philastrius* of Brescia, *Ambrose* of Milan, *Jerome*, (who cites our epistle in more than a dozen of his works;) the same Council of Carthage which was held, it is asserted, under the eyes of Augustin, in 397.

Eusebius places it in the rank of the *antilegomena;* but takes care to add, twice, that the epistle was acknowledged by many, and that it was customary to read it publicly with the other epistles in most of the churches.[4]

It must be carefully noticed that he is the first of the fathers

[1] Origen, Opp., tom. iv., p. 23.
[2] Quod lapsis spes veniae non sit deneganda, ed. Maur. Paris, 1725, p. 17.
[3] Opp. Graec., tom. iii., p. 62. See Eichhorn, iv., p. 441.
[4] Hist. Eccl., iii., 25, vi., 13, 14, ii., 33. See Prop. 46.

who speaks of doubts entertained relative to this epistle; and we have just seen, in the case of Origen, his unjust partiality on this point. These doubts of which he speaks had no historical foundation; and we learn, at a later period, from Didymus and Jerome, that they were owing to the pretended apocryphal citations of Jude about Moses and Enoch.

CHAPTER VI.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ANTILEGOMENA.

387. We must first of all recollect once more, that if we suppose the New Testament to be divided into twenty-six equal parts, all that we are going to say of the second canon relates only to one of these twenty-six parts. And another fact ought not to be forgotten, which marks that slow and silent process of examination by which a secret Providence designed to conduct at last all the churches of the East and West to that marvellous unity in which we have seen them remain to this day for 1500 years. It is that, during this long and laborious exercise of the consciences of Christians, if there was a number greater or less of churches and of respectable teachers who, suspending their judgment, still harboured doubts of this or the other of the five short epistles; yet, at the same time, these same epistles never ceased to be regarded as canonical by a part, and most frequently by the greatest part, of the Christian churches.

388. It must be remarked, too, that, in the primitive churches, the books of the second canon never occupied the same position as the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. The canonicity of the five epistles was at first, indeed, contested in several places; but it was never absolutely rejected, whilst it was quite otherwise with the apocryphal books. The latter, during the same period, instead of being objects of doubt, were resolutely rejected everywhere from the inspired collection; though they were often respected under the character of ecclesiastical books, that is to say they were classed, as by the Anglican Church in the present day,

among writings useful to be read in certain assemblies of the Church. But to say then that such and such of our short epistles was an object of doubt, was to say that it was thought possible some day to see these researches satisfied and these doubts removed. And we know that in fact the doubts ceased, and that the five epistles, controverted for a time, were at last everywhere received.

We shall shew elsewhere how it has not been permitted to the churches, though divided so widely among themselves on every other subject, to be so on this, and how Divine Providence has here evidently displayed His all-powerful hand.

389. But it must be especially remarked here, and ought strongly to confirm our confidence in the final results of this long exercise of conscientious scruples, that this labour has always been pursued under a system of full independence and mutual support. This fact is very extraordinary; it impresses on the sacred collection a very remarkable character, and we shall have to examine it more closely under a most elevated point of view. Certainly, when we consider that the examination of the first Christians relative to the second canon lasted two centuries and a half, and that, nevertheless, it was always carried on with perfect liberty, every teacher having been able to continue his inquiries, and freely publish his doubts in reference to this or the other book of the second canon, without the churches having been seen to condemn one another on this important point; when we see these long and free investigations produce at last the unanimous agreement which all the churches in Christendom present on this point alone for 1500 years, we then receive a powerful impression of the secret and sovereign agency which has conducted this holy affair throughout. But we must abstain for the present from dwelling on this point of view, and speak here only of the powerful historical testimony rendered by so free an agreement to the canon of Scripture. How admirable it is that, in the very ages when so many acts of ecclesiastical violence were accomplished everywhere to obtain unity on every other point, yet without obtaining it, we can nowhere find that any act of authority ever interposed on this—no collective influence of bishops—no prescription of the civil power—no decrees of councils to impose on believers

such or such a book, or to make them accept a complete collection, of the Scriptures, before the time of personal conviction!

It was thus that Christians all over the world, satisfied by degrees, added to their sacred canon one after another those of the short late epistles about which some churches had hesitated, until at last their unanimous agreement came to give a reason to those among them who had never doubted.

390. We have already stated the reasons why some of the primitive churches delayed receiving into their collection the shorter epistles, and more particularly those of John and Jude; but we may still point out some others. For example, it must be considered that, if the epistles of Paul, addressed at first to certain persons or certain churches, owing to this one circumstance, would be accepted from the first moment, (the originals, for example, being preserved even to the days of Tertullian in the apostolic churches,)[1] it could not be thus with the three short letters of John and of Jude, which, not sent directly to any particular church, had not, to secure their general reception, either the authority of a writer still living, nor even the testimony of a depository pointed out by him.

In the second place, it must be expected during this long process of examination, that the churches, according to their very different circumstances, would arrive at different judgments. Some in a better position for being more readily satisfied, would be the first to receive the entire canon; others, at a greater distance, would suspend their judgment while waiting for fresh light; others, again, preoccupied by certain objections, (which they were not yet in a condition to resolve,) would retain their doubts, and allow themselves time for examination. We can understand, for example, that churches which spoke the Syriac language must have received

[1] De Praescriptione Haereticor., cap. xxxvi. "Come now, thou who wishest to exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation," he writes in the year 207, "run through the apostolic churches, in which the very chairs of the apostles are occupied, and where their authentic letters are recited, uttering their voice and representing their countenance, (apud quo ipsae authenticae litterae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantes faciem uniuscujusque.) Is Achaia near thee? thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedon, thou hast Philippi—thou hast Thessalonica. If thou art able to reach Asia, thou hast Ephesus. If thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome," &c.

the Epistle of James from the year 62; while their respectful attachment for their admirable Peshito version would dispose them to receive very slowly what was not included in it from the earliest times. It was in this way that one church arrived at conviction after another church, and that all were led by this patient and sure labour to receive at last the whole canon.

391. It is of importance to remark, that it was not even desirable that the five late epistles (we might almost call them posthumous) should obtain a very prompt acceptance.

If the twenty sacred books of the first canon, recommended by the ministry and presence of the apostles, were immediately received, it was expedient, on the contrary, as to the five epistles, that every teacher, and every church, before giving them a place in the canon, should attentively examine their origin, and inform themselves of all their claims, in order to guard with the greatest care against confounding the Scripture with those numerous forged books which were then in circulation under supposititious names. In the midst of this confusion it was needful, in order to decide, that they should arrive at the most entire certainty respecting their authenticity. Such a labour of examination was therefore necessary, which, for a part of the churches, demanded much patience and much time, and was carried on without partiality or precipitation, without human compulsion, and in the most perfect liberty.

392. Thus, then, these very doubts with which many churches began on the subject of the *antilegomena*, far from disquieting our faith, should go to confirm it. For they give us, in the first place, the assurance, that not only the first collection of our Scriptures, but that each of the books separately, with which it was to be enlarged, underwent, before its admittance, the jealous, free, and sacredly severe scrutiny of the universal Church, without any species of constraint being employed to enforce its acceptance.

Secondly, these very doubts of some churches on the subject of the second canon, if we compare them with the immediate unanimity of their agreement on the subject of the first, give us three valuable assurances respecting both canons.

And first, as to the twenty sacred books of which the first canon was composed, these hesitations shew us that no reason of doubt

whatever presented itself to any of the primitive churches in the course of the three first centuries.

And as to the second canon, these very hesitations of some churches testify to us that those who, being better informed in the same age, did not hesitate, had found from the first sufficient reasons to receive our five small epistles on their first appearance.

Lastly, these very delays testify to us that when all these churches, at first hesitating, ended in agreeing with those who from their better position had never doubted, they must have had before their eyes most convincing proofs in order to give up their first opposition.

It is thus that they were led by the patient and sure action of Divine Providence to that striking agreement which we see them shew down to the present day for fifteen centuries; the admirable result of their researches and of their liberty.

393. To these sacred doubts of the primitive churches, to their jealousies and continual researches, we are indebted for another precious fact attested by history, namely, "that the Church has never received into the canon any book of which, at a later period, it has been obliged to acknowledge the illegitimacy." I speak of the New Testament, the volume which is committed to us, and not of the Old, of which the Jews are the only true depositaries;[1] for we grant that, with respect to the latter, the priests of Rome have allowed themselves some late liberties, but *without any consequence: late*, we say, since it is only in the sixteenth century of Christianity, and without any logical consequence, we say again, (at least for the doctrine of the canon;) since we know with Athanasius, and we repeat with the whole Eastern church,[2] that "the Christian Church of the New Testament receives from the Hebrew Church of the Old Testament the sacred books of that Testament," because "*to the Jews*," as St Paul has said, (Rom. iii. 2,) "*have been committed the oracles of God.*" When we say, that "the ancient Church has never received into its canon any book of which, at a later period, it has been obliged to acknowledge the illegitimacy," some persons perhaps will be tempted to

[1] Rom. iii. 2.

[2] These words are from the "Great Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, approved by the Holy Synod." Moscow, 1839.

set in opposition to us that kind of approbation given in some churches during the second, third, and fourth centuries to certain authentic but not canonical writings, such as the letter of the Roman Clement to the Corinthians, or even to apocryphal or spurious books, (*νόθα*,) such as *The Shepherd of Hermas* and *The Apocalypse of Peter*.

But it would be without foundation for any one to represent the partial use that certain churches may have made of these books for their public reading, as a recognition of their canonicity. On the contrary, this fact examined more closely, and taken in connexion with the general usages of the Church at that period, far from compromising the true canon, only serves to confirm it, as Dr Thiersch has very clearly shewn in his essay "on the Restoration of the Historical Stand-point for the Criticism of the New Testament."[1]

394. "At the end of the first century," he says, "the Church, henceforth deprived of the presence of the apostles, and penetrated with a spirit (sometimes excessive) of holy jealousy for them, redoubled their attachment for the scriptures of the first canon, and assumed a character eminently conservative, which would be on its guard against every innovation. The use of its first canon was already consecrated and unassailable. Towards the third part of the second century, the generation of those who had personally known the apostles began to be extinct. Some believers, such as Papias, devoted themselves to collect the last traditions of the disciples of the Lord, to save them from oblivion; but it was not till the reign of Antoninus Pius, during the second third of the century, that the first beginnings appeared of ecclesiastical science. Towards the end of the same century, in the time of Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus, there was a disposition to search out the very few and short writings composed after the appearance of the New Testament. Irenæus called to his aid against the Gnostics of his time, the letter (*ἱκανωτάτην*) of the Roman Clement to the Corinthians, that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and *The Shepherd of Hermas*. For to fill up this great void of literature and history, the pious teacher appeared to have

[1] Versuch zur Wiederherstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Critik des N. T., p. 366 and following, the beginning of his sixth chapter, &c.

possessed no other remains of primitive Christian antiquity but these three authors, and perhaps the letters of Ignatius. Yet these feeble relics appeared more precious in proportion to their fewness; so that, if God had not interposed, it might have happened that the extravagant lovers of antiquity would have attributed more value to them than they really possessed. But this was not the case with Irenæus. On the contrary, he shewed himself very prudent in this respect, and he is, of all the fathers, the most conformed to the Scriptures, as he is, at the same time, the most faithful representative of the true tradition of the primitive churches. While he was combating in Gaul the heresies of his age, his contemporary Clement, who, at Alexandria in Egypt, attempted to associate with Christianity an impure mixture of a stoical and mystic Platonism, was, on the contrary, the one among the fathers who was at the greatest distance from the spirit of the apostles, as well as from the true tradition; and he was also the father who occupied himself most with the apocryphal writings of his time. He is the first who mentions *the Epistle of Barnabas, the Apocalypse of Peter*, and the *Preaching* (*κήρυγμα*) *of Peter*, and who, citing *the Gospel of the Egyptians* to refute the heretics, endeavoured to affix a plausible sense to the mystic fancies of that book.

"And yet even with Clement of Alexandria the canon remained intact, and you find in his writings the difference clearly expressed which the Church then placed between the *Divine Scriptures* and all other books. Even when he pays a literary attention to *the Gospel of the Egyptians*, he distinguishes it very clearly from the *four canonical Gospels*.

"Towards the end of the second century, the *anagnosis* of a book gave it a sanction, and constituted it, in the eyes of the Church, an inspired scripture; for they then admitted to that honour of public reading no other books but those which were acknowledged as Divine and canonical. But it was not so after that epoch. The Church from that time was widely extended, and the worship having taken new development, the notion of mystery was introduced into it, in imitation of the mystery of the Gentiles; and as they distinguished carefully the penitents and the catechumens from the faithful and the consecrated, so they came to distinguish

also different degrees in the use of the Scriptures, and in that of the other books which were read in public. Around the primitive canon the books of the second canon came to be placed in the first rank, which they did not dare to assimilate entirely to the first; then around these some other writings which were held to be edifying and deserving of respect, but which, though admitted to be read, (*ἀναγινωσκόμενα,*) and thereby *δεδημοσιευμένα,* (as Eusebius terms it,)—that is, set apart for public and popular use, —they were not *ἐνδιαθήκα,* included in the scriptures of the New Testament. Henceforward, then, the public reading being no longer a recognition of canonicity, a new class of books was formed, called *ecclesiastical,* which had not been used formerly in worship, but which came to take their place in the train of the books called *canonical.* In many churches *The Shepherd of Hermas,* and even other writings of an inferior rank, were read to the catechumens; but in doing this there was no intention of touching the canon of the primitive books, and the notion of the bounds of the canon remained complete and universal, as any one may be satisfied by reading Origen, Eusebius, and the various authors whom we have cited."

395. Another kind of public readings, held on certain days of the year, was also introduced during the second century in some churches for the celebration of the anniversaries of the martyrs, (*ἡμέραι γενέθλιαι ;*) for on these days the narrative of their death was read over their graves,[1] as we see, for the first time, in the case of the epistle of the church at Smyrna on the death of Polycarp.[2] It was by an analogous custom that at Corinth, even two or three centuries after, on a certain day of the year, the letter of Clement of Rome to the primitive church of that city was read over; and, besides, on account of its antiquity and the name of its author, this letter approached nearer than any other uncanonical writing to the authority attributed to the second canon, so that Eusebius tells us (vi., 12) that in many churches, and in Cæsarea among others, (*καθ' ἡμᾶς,*) it had been long made a part of the public reading, (*δεδημοσιευμένην.*) But there was still a great difference between this use of it and the acknowledg-

[1] Hence the term *legends,* (*writings to be read.*)

[2] *Ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκύκλιος,* cap. xviii.

ment of it as belonging to the canon. So Eusebius, in his famous twenty-fifth chapter, (book iii.,) takes great care not to put it, we do not say in the rank of the first canon, but even in that of the second; at the same time, he avoids placing it among the apocryphal or spurious books, (*ἐν τοῖς νόθοις.*) If he calls it *uncontroverted,* (*ὁμολογουμένη,*) (iii., 38,) it is evidently in the sense of its authenticity, not of its canonicity. He esteems it very highly, ("a majestic and admirable epistle," he calls it,) but does not make it a canonical book.

We find it placed, indeed, at the end of the fourth volume of the New Testament of the famous *Alexandrian manuscript* of Cyril Lucas. But this fact is of no weight as regards the canon, since we also find in the same manuscript, at the end of this epistle, the second pretended epistle of Clement, an epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus, the apocryphal psalms attributed to Solomon, and fourteen hymns, of which the eleventh is in honour of the Virgin Mary, (*τῆς θεοτόκου.*)

396. There was yet another development which took place later in the *readings of the Church,* but not till the fourth century. We refer to the homilies. Justin Martyr[1] tells us that, in the assemblies of his time, "after the reader (of the Scriptures) had finished, (*πανσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος,*) the president (*ὁ προεστως*) delivers a discourse of admonition and exhortation, (*διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν . . . . ποιεῖται.*)" But we do not learn that, till the second or third century, any of these discourses (*λόγων*) were committed to writing. Origen is the first father of whom any homilies are extant. It became the practice, in course of time, to read in some churches the homilies of the most celebrated teachers. Jerome informs us that was the case with the Syriac sermons of Ephrem.[2] "He had acquired such renown," he says, (*ad tantam venit claritudinem,*) "that his discourses, *after the reading of the Scriptures,* were publicly recited." We know, also, that the same honour was shewn, at a later period, to those of Gregory, Chrysostom, and Augustin. But these recitations, as we have seen, only took place *post lec-*

[1] First Apology, ch. lxvii.
[2] De Viris Illustr., cap. cv.

tionem Scripturarum. They might be a substitute for preaching, but never for the Word of God.

397. Lastly, here and there, as far as we can gather from some very isolated facts, when the limits of the canon had been firmly established, it might happen that a bishop permitted in his church, after the reading of the Scriptures, that of some apocryphal or spurious (*νόθου*) book, if the book appeared to him orthodox in its doctrine, and pure in its morality. An example has been cited from Eusebius, (vi., 12,) which some persons might be disposed to abuse, but which seems rather to confirm the doctrine of the canon. It relates to a pretended *Gospel of Peter*, which some members of the church at Rhosus (in Cilicia) desired to use, not as a canonical scripture, but as an edifying book. Serapion, then bishop, tells us, "that being come to them without knowing the book, and without having gone through it, (*μὴ διελθων,*) because he believed it conformable to the faith, he had said to them, 'If it is only this that causes your disputes, let it be read.' But now, (he writes,) after what has been told me, and taking into consideration that it has been used in favour of the Docetae, I have read it; and, having found, among many things that are conformable to the sound doctrine of the Saviour, teachings that differ from it, I have placed them under your inspection, hoping shortly to be with you." He then makes an extract, with a refutation, exposing its falsehoods, (*ἀπελέγχων τὰ ψευδῶς ἐν αὐτῷ εἰρημένα.*) "As to us, my brethren," he adds, "we receive Peter, and the other apostles, as Christ himself; but as to the writings which are given to us falsely under their name, (*τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα,*) we, as experienced persons, (*ἔμπειροι,*) reject them, knowing that we have not received such from our predecessors, (*ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν.*)"

It is thus that this accidental oversight of Serapion serves to shew the ordinary vigilance of the pastors of the second and third centuries, and "that the exception in this case, as often happens," says Dr Thiersch, "serves only to confirm the rule."

398. There exist, as we have said, among the seven catholic epistles, affinities and points of coincidence, each of them being a testimony to the authenticity of some others. We shall give some examples.

(1.) A modern author[1] has noticed an interesting connexion between the First Epistle of Peter and the second of John.

The epistle of Peter, addressed from Babylon to the *elect* Jews scattered through the provinces of Asia Minor, ends with a *salutation of that* (church) "*which is at Babylon, elected together with you and Mark.*" The epistle of John, on the other hand, addressed on the part of "*the elder to the elect lady* (*ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ*) *and her children,*" ends with a *salutation* "*from the children of her elect sister.*" It has often been disputed whether *the elect sister* and *the elect lady* are two *persons*, as most moderns have thought, or two *churches*, as most of the ancients thought, and as Michaelis believes, according to which *κυρίᾳ* would be an ellipsis for *κυρίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, an expression which, among the ancient Greeks, and especially at Athens, meant *a regular, fixed assembly of the people*, and which, in St John, might design *a church regularly assembled every Lord's-day.*

The First Epistle of John, according to the tradition of the ancients,[2] was addressed to the *Parthians*, among whom (as we know from Philo and Josephus)[3] there was an immense multitude of Jews. And thus in the same manner as Peter had written his first epistle to the Jewish Christians *dispersed through Asia*, (1 Pet. i. 1,) John might have addressed his first to the Jewish Christians scattered through Babylonia and the other provinces of the Parthians.

But Clement of Alexandria, in a work of which we have only a Latin translation,[4] has also said *that the Second Epistle of John is addressed to the Parthians*, and the Latin translator having mistaken *Παρθίους* for *παρθένους*, has translated it *Secunda Johannis Epistola quae ad Virgines inscripta*, while there is not a word in it that concerns *virgins*. And the same Clement has said elsewhere "*that this Second Epistle of John was written to a certain elect Babylonian,*" and thinks (like Jerome) that the word *elect* means, not an *elect person*, but an *elect church*.

[1] Dr Wordsworth in his eleventh discourse on the Canon, p. 277. London, 1848.

[2] Estius, in Ep. 1 Joh. Praef., p. 201, (Rouen, 1709.) "Veterum traditio est ad *Parthos* scriptam esse Johannis epistolam. Hunc titulum ei tribuunt Hyginus Papa . . . . et ipse Augustinus."—*Quaest. Evang.*, ii., 39.

[3] Philo, De Legat. ad Caium, 36; Josephus, Antiq., xxiii., 12.

[4] Adumbrat, pp. 10, 11.

Thus, then, the apostle of the circumcision addressed from Babylon his first epistle to the Jews of the Asiatic Dispersion—a province assigned to John—and ended it with this salutation,—*Your co-elect sister who is at Babylon* (*ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ*) *salutes you, and so does Marcus my son;* and on his side John, the apostle of the provinces of Asia, addressed his "*to the elect Church,*" and ends in his turn with the salutation—"*The children of thy elect sister greet thee,* who art at Babylon."

We must here call to mind that triple dispersion of the Jews, as Luke has stated it, on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 8.)

[1.] "*Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia.*" This was the *dispersion,* subject to the Parthians, with Babylon for the metropolis. [2.] "Those who inhabit Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia." This was the *dispersion* of Asia. [3.] "Egypt, and the parts of Libya about Cyrene." This was the *dispersion* of Africa. These three dispersions which Peter had addressed at the Pentecost, and which formed his spiritual province, had been each the object of his apostolic care: that of Babylon, by the visit he made to it in person; that of Asia, by the letter which he wrote from Babylon; that of Africa, by the mission of his son Mark, the first bishop of Alexandria.[1]

These first relations between the catholic epistles, though founded on a disputable interpretation, have seemed to us worthy of notice; but we have others.

399. (2.) Peter, writing his first epistle after that of James, bears him an indirect but significant testimony, by adopting and incorporating, as we have already said, a great many of his peculiar traits.

(3.) Jude, whose epistle followed not only that of James, but even the second of Peter, introduces himself as a brother of that James who was known to the churches by his ministry, by his epistle, and by his martyrdom, (in the year 62.)

(4.) The same Jude adopts very freely, as we have said, the language of the Second Epistle of Peter, as Peter in his first adopted that of James.

(5.) Jude even goes so far as to declare that he cites one of the

[1] Jerome, Catal. Scriptor. Eccl., viii.

apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (ver. 17) when he reports in its own terms a prophecy of the Second Epistle of Peter.

(6.) Peter, in his turn, in his second epistle, earnestly recommends *all the epistles of Paul, his beloved brother*, putting them on a level with the rest of the scriptures, and denouncing eternal destruction to those who wrest them.

(7.) The same Peter in his second epistle alludes to the first, (iii. 1.)

(8.) John blends and corroborates the fourfold testimony of his Gospel and his three epistles by employing in a striking manner the same thoughts and the same expressions.

(9.) As John in the fourth Gospel attests the authority of the three others by the very care he has taken to be silent on almost all the events already reported in them, so also we may say that in his three epistles the same apostle attests the authenticity of the epistles of Peter and Paul by the silence he preserves on the important doctrines already so abundantly expounded by these two great apostles. In dilating only on the precepts of Christian love, John silently informs us of the entire approbation he gives to these teachings. This is an observation of Dr Wordsworth.[1]

400. We leave these considerations, which may have their interest, but the importance of which disappears before thoughts of a more general and elevated order that are about to occupy our attention.

We believe that we have hitherto sufficiently demonstrated from history the incomparable authenticity of the New Testament; but we have indicated at the outset that to arrive at the same conclusions in reference to the two Testaments, there is a still more excellent way.

This is the way of Faith. It will be the subject of our Second Part.

[1] On the Canon, p. 285.

PART SECOND.

THE METHOD OF FAITH.

401. We are come to what, after all, forms the surest foundation of our confidence relative to the entire collection of the Scriptures.

But it will be necessary, before entering on this important subject, to premise two observations.

The first is, that our inquiry is no longer confined to the New Testament. Henceforward we shall treat of the entire canon.

In the second place, we feel bound to forewarn the reader that, in this Second Part of our task, we do not address exactly the same class of persons as in the first. In the preceding pages, our arguments were presented indifferently to believers and unbelievers. Henceforward it is sufficiently evident, that in explaining reasons of faith we address ourselves to men of faith—to readers who, without being quite clear respecting the entire collection of our sacred books, are yet persuaded that, in a part at least of what the Scripture calls "the oracles of God," it is God himself who speaks to us; so that there its teachings must be received with all confidence as given by "the Holy Spirit, sent down from heaven."

402. To you, then, earnest though unconfirmed Christians, we shall henceforward speak of the canon; to you, who read with reverence what you acknowledge of the Scriptures, and who wish with an upright heart to serve the living and true God according to His Word, and to wait for His Son Jesus from heaven, who will soon judge the living and the dead by that Word. We appeal to that part of the Scriptures which you acknowledge and revere, and from this our arguments will be taken.

403. Let it be carefully noted, we are not here taking the question for granted; nor shall we attempt to establish it by anything contained in itself. When we appeal to the faith to justify the canon in all its parts, when we avail ourselves for this purpose of a positive dogma, when we draw this dogma from the New Testament, reduced, if you please, to narrower dimensions, we by no means place the Christian reader in an illogical circle, since this positive dogma is given us by a part of the Scriptures that none of the adversaries of the canon have ever called in question; not even Marcion, nor Basilides, nor Heracleon, nor Ptolemy; not even, in our own day, the Tubingen school. Moreover, we shall confirm its sense and value by the conduct of God during all the ages of His antecedent revelations, and by an assemblage of striking and incontestable facts.

Yet, before expounding this doctrine of the canon, and passing in this manner from the method of science to that of faith, it will be desirable to compare in some points these two sources of information, and the two kinds of conviction they are fitted to produce.

BOOK I.

THE TWO METHODS OPEN FOR THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE CANON.

---

404. THE Church, as we have said,[1] has two methods of attaining satisfaction respecting the entire collection of the Scriptures—that of science and that of faith: that of science, which appeals to history; and that of faith, which appeals to a doctrine. We have hitherto proceeded along the first; we now enter on the second.

These two methods are sure, rational, and accessible; and each has its advantages; yet the most excellent, the most rational, the most indispensable, and the most sure, is the method of faith.

[1] Prop. 5, p. 2.

CHAPTER I.

COMPARISON OF THESE TWO METHODS.

405. SCIENCE, in studying the history of the Sacred Volume, presents to our notice at once two very important facts. There is, in the first place, the wonderful unanimity with which all the churches at the present day throughout the world, even those most opposed to one another in their institutions and doctrines, agree in offering us for fifteen centuries one and the same canon of the New Testament. Next, that among the twenty-seven books of which it is composed, twenty can be counted which, even before these fifteen last centuries, and from the days of the apostles, have never ceased to be received by all Christendom.

To render these two great facts more striking, science, studying the history of the first ages with the greatest care, shews us, first of all, how the lives of almost all the apostles being remarkably prolonged, enabled the primitive Church to have recourse to these men of God, for more than sixty years, to assure her of the canon as it was gradually formed; so that, under their sanction, the numberless churches already spread over the world received the living oracles of God to transmit them to us. Moreover, it acquaints us with the sacred custom of all the churches as to the public reading of the Scriptures; and exhibits to us, under the universal control of the *Anagnosis*, the completion of the canon, and its maintenance everywhere, without constraint, noise, or dispute. It does more: It seeks out in the history of Christian literature all the primitive monuments of the canon, and everywhere it finds incontestable traces of it; everywhere the same voice of confirmation is heard. In a word, nothing can be more

conclusive or more solid, in a matter of historic testimony, than the majestic assemblage of proofs accumulated in favour of the first canon; and we are constrained to acknowledge that the literary history of the whole world offers no example of an authenticity so strongly guaranteed.

406. Yet, when we have studied these facts, science presents us with two others of a nature to disturb our confidence. The first is, that among the twenty-seven writings of the New Testament there are two which, though universally received during the two first ages of the Church, were questioned for a certain time at the beginning of the third; and the second is, that five short, later epistles, though recognised from the beginning by a great number, (it has even been said by the greatest number,) were not received by all till the first quarter of the fourth century.* From these two facts naturally arise the two following questions:—

If the wonderful unanimity of the first Christians respecting twenty books of the first canon is fitted to inspire the Church with such strong assurance, will there not be, in their temporary hesitation about the seven other books, something to shake her confidence in the part of the canon thus disputed, and perhaps in the whole canon? And, on the other hand, if these books are, after all, divine, how is it that they were not from the first universally received? We believe it has been satisfactorily shewn, that the same science which has raised this twofold objection is perfectly competent to answer it. It gives the reasons of the alleged facts. It exhibits in broad daylight the usages of the ancient Church; it explains why the second canon was formed more slowly; it shews that the second-first, for a time the object of doctrinal prejudices, was never assailed by historical objections; it shews that the hesitation of a part of the primitive churches respecting the second, attests their vigilant jealousy for the sacred deposits; it attests the astonishing Christian liberty which never ceased to pervade every place on this important question; it collects the testimony borne to the disputed books, and shews most distinctly the prodigious difference, in this respect, between these sacred writings and all spurious books. In one word, to all the objections which are attempted to be drawn from its archives, it answers by these very archives; and thus it establishes the legitimacy of our

entire collection on historical bases, far superior to all that the literary history of the whole world can offer for any other book.

407. Still it must be said that, notwithstanding all the eminent services this first means of conviction can render to our faith, we ought not to use it so much for a foundation as to pave the way for it to act as an auxiliary or a defence. Our faith is otherwise founded. So in the first times of the gospel, "miracles," as Calvin[1] observes, "were never to be separated from the Word, and served only for aids and supports of faith, preparing some for it, and confirming it in others;" and in the same way, as our Lord has said, that one rising from the dead would not produce faith in those who refused to hearken to Moses and the prophets, so also (we hasten to declare it) all the proofs furnished by science are incapable of imparting a living and true faith to those who have not derived it from the Scriptures, rendered operative by the Holy Spirit.

408. Woe, then, to our teachers and our churches, if they imagined that, to obtain certainty on the subject of the canon, there is no other foundation than the study of the fathers and of history! Our faith requires a support much more certain, and of easier access—speaking more to the inner man, and founded on a more solid basis.

Christian experience has attested this to pious men in all ages, and this our Reformers have taken care to express in our most accredited confessions of faith. "We know," they have said,[2] "these books to be canonical, and the infallible rule of our faith, not so much by the general agreement of the Church, as by the testimony of the Holy Spirit."

409. In speaking thus, they do not mean to assert that the testimony rendered by the Holy Spirit to the Scriptures in the heart of every Christian who has been truly converted by them, applies itself directly and in an equal measure to every book and every chapter and every sentence of which they are composed. What they mean to say is only this, that to every truly converted Christian the Bible is presented in some way to his soul, with evidence, as a miraculous book—as a living and efficacious word,

[1] Commentary on Acts v. 12.

[2] Confession of the Churches of France, art. iv.

—which "pierces even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit" —illumines in a moment the inmost depths of his being, and reveals to him the features, hitherto unknown, of his inner man—softening, persuading, and subduing it with incomparable power. Certainly, never book spake like this book! "Verily, it told me all that ever I did!" "Whence knowest thou me, Lord? Truly, Lord, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." Henceforth the soul can no longer be under a mistake about it. To it this book, in the whole or in part, is certainly from on high. The seals of the Almighty are attached to it. But this "witness of the Holy Spirit," of which our fathers spoke, and which every Christian has more or less acknowledged when he has read his Bible with vital efficacy—this witness may at first be heard by him only in a single page of the Scriptures; but this page suffices to spread over the book which contains it an incomparable lustre in his eyes. And as to the divine authenticity of each of the parts of which the entire collection is composed, we shall soon shew that a Christian reader has legitimate reasons for retaining the conviction that the divine origin of these passages in which the Holy Spirit has spoken to him, guarantees that of the rest, and that, moreover, he can rest in this respect on the general agreement of the churches, and on the fidelity of God; because a doctrine of his faith authorises him to recognise in this general agreement a work of eternal wisdom. He will regard the whole book as divine long before each of its parts has been able to convince him by itself of its own divinity. Is it not thus that it is sufficient for a naturalist when he examines by a solar microscope in the fin of a living fish a space of the size of a pin's point, and beholds there fourteen streams of blood running constantly night and day in two opposite directions, and accomplishing night and day with astonishing beauty the double wonder of the circulation, —is it not, we say, sufficient for him to have had this spectacle under his eyes to infer most legitimately that this potent mystery of the blood and of life is accomplished likewise in the whole body?

CHAPTER II.

OBJECTIONS TO THE METHOD OF SCIENCE.

410. THIS method of science, which can render such valuable service to the cause of God as long as it is not allowed to pass the limits of its legitimate use, is, nevertheless, exposed to grave objections, when persons are disposed to follow it without, at the same time, making use of the method of faith.

SECTION FIRST.

ITS NOVELTY.

411. An observation which must strike every person who attends to the habits of the believers of the Old Testament, including the apostles and their Master himself, is this, that the procedure which seeks for proofs of the canon in sacred criticism, and in the monuments of history, was never theirs. They had for the Old Testament no other documents to consult than the holy book itself, and yet its canon was always received by all. Saints, prophets, apostles, and the first Christians, had then evidently another method of satisfying themselves than that of science. What was it? We shall mention it presently; and, besides, this is at present not the question. But, meanwhile, let us first recognise by this important fact, that we ourselves are able to have for the New Testament other guarantees than criticism and history. If in the present day we had not a history of the canon of the New Testament any more than existed formerly for Moses and the prophets, ought we, while maintaining, like the apostles, the firmest confidence in the canon of the Old Testament, to

regard ourselves as without a guarantee for the confidence we ask for the New? No, certainly. We must, then, seek elsewhere for these guarantees.

SECTION SECOND.

ITS INACCESSIBILITY.

412. But, again, what must strike us, in the exclusive use of this method of science, is its inaccessibility. In order to follow it, philological knowledge and prolonged researches are requisite, which, generally, are beyond the reach of unlettered men and of pious women; while the method of faith always remains open for every Christian who reads with reverence the Scriptures of his God. Such a man carries in his own soul a witness superior to all the traditions of history, and all the citations of the fathers.

SECTION THIRD.

ITS WANT OF SPIRITUALITY.

413. More than this, you will always suffer in the method of science, from its absolute want of spirituality. Addressing its proofs only to the cold regions of your understanding, and having nothing to do with the depths of your moral being, it can produce nothing more than a literary conviction, without influence over your affections, or control over your will; while the method of faith, by placing you before the God of the Scriptures, and shewing Him to you there always like Himself, presents you with heartfelt proofs that correspond with the aspirations of your soul and lay hold of your inmost convictions.

SECTION FOURTH.

ITS DANGERS.

414. Yet, again, another consideration, still more important, is this,—that this method of science, when followed in too absolute a manner, without being constantly restricted to its legitimate use, is full of dangers. In speaking thus, far from us be the thought of discouraging its use when conducted with wisdom.

But it is too certain that, by seeking only among the documents of history, and the lucubrations of criticism, for the light they throw upon the canon, even a sincere piety may be easily endangered. If we make this pursuit an exclusive study for a length of time,—if we are not careful to refresh our souls in the vivifying fountains of faith by a devout use of the Scriptures,—if we do not thus place ourselves in daily communication with the divine facts they present to us, with the power they display, with the living God who speaks to us in them—here is our danger. This study leads us, by a logical and necessary abstraction, but deceptive and full of peril, to reason upon our Scriptures as we would on purely human compositions, and as if we knew nothing of the divine dispensations which have given them to us, nor of the promises and commands which they address to us. Hence you take into consideration only the common accidents of their history; and, thus occupying yourself, you create for yourself a duty, which very soon, alas! becomes a habit, of forgetting that, as a Christian, you believe in the intervention of the Holy Spirit in the composition of these books. Thus we reason on their characteristics and their destiny, as if the great facts of redemption had never transpired in the world, and as if God had never interfered with them. But "all the majesty of the gospel will go to ruin," Calvin has said,[1] "when we no longer know that the living Saviour speaks from heaven." But Jesus Christ is living. He promised His apostles to be with them to the end of the world—that is, no doubt, to be with their testimony and their writings, to bless them with success. And yet no work of critical science on the canon has ever said a single word on this truth, of the presence and agency of Jesus Christ in His Church—this great, divine, and perpetual fact. The question is discussed, on the contrary, as if it related to the Koran or the Zendavesta,—as if Jesus Christ was as dead as Mohammed or Confucius,—as if He no longer watched over the destinies of His Church, and, consequently, over the books which have given it life and perpetuity,—as if, after having given His word to the apostles by the Holy Spirit, he took no further interest in it, but cast it to the winds, exposed to all hazards.

[1] Commentary on the Acts, i., 1–3.

Hence, what is it that will happen too often in this important concern? It is that the faith of many will receive the most serious injury; it is that, as an effect of this continual process of abstraction, in which science makes you forget, as a logical duty, for a time, that you are a Christian—you will forget it, alas! far too long, and sometimes without ever regaining the remembrance. Your soul, under this regimen, loses the habits of devotion, and acquires those of doubt; its spiritual sense becomes palsied; at last, it admits the most disastrous thoughts respecting the Scriptures of its God. This abstraction, which was at first only a method, becomes a permanent state of mind, and you can look at the sacred Word only on its human side. You very soon despise it under this aspect; and, no longer remembering the blessed emotions it called forth, you forget all the divine interventions which you once admired in the history of redemption, from the days of Adam, Abel, and Enoch, to those of Noah, of Moses, of David, and the prophets,—to those of our Lord and His apostles, to those great revivals so often effected in the Church by the manifest power of Jesus Christ. It is thus, alas! that too often the soul, devoted to the science of the schools, and emboldening itself in this pernicious method, has seen the flood-gates of scepticism open before it, and the waves have hurried it into the abyss of infidelity, to overwhelm it there, perhaps, beyond recovery. In the Scriptures, so long ill-used, it can see only fallible documents, and a confused heap of errors. At last, it revolts openly against them; and you have seen the most audacious impieties rise up in the schools of science, because the man who has lost reverence is quite ready for revolt, and God punishes self-created darkness by darkness, (Rom. i. 28.) Such was the fall of our first parents, who, from the moment they lent an ear to the suggestion of the tempter, "Yea, hath God said?" very soon allowed him to say, "Certainly, you can resist Him; certainly, if you do it, you will not die; certainly, 'your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as gods.'" Then the fall was consummated!

415. Perhaps our meaning may be better understood by the following illustration:—

Suppose a scribe, a contemporary of Jesus Christ, who for a long time had studied His character only in the perfectly human

circumstances of His life of humiliation, His family at Nazareth, His artisan's dress, His common trade, His callous hands, His popular dialect, His mother advanced in years,[1] His poor sisters, and His four brothers who at one time did not believe in Him, and wished, with His mother, on one occasion to get hold of His person as of a man "beside himself,"[2]—this man, no doubt, would have experienced for "the Word made flesh" something similar to what we here fear for the written Word on the part of the critical science which has for a long time studied it only in its human destinies and external features. Let him have followed Jesus in His daily walk, when surrounded by twelve fishermen and persons of bad reputation—travelling on foot, eating with them, worn out with fatigue, laying Himself down to sleep, rising up, sighing and weeping, even "with strong crying and tears," "without form or comeliness, and no beauty that He should be desired," (Isa. liii. 2;)—would not such a man find it more difficult every day to recognise in this despised being the Christ promised ages before—the eternal Word, the Creator who weighs the mountains in scales, the Searcher of the hearts and reins, the Judge who will return on the clouds of heaven, and of whose years there shall be no end? And if this scribe had not taken pains, at the same time, to study His incomparable discourses, His divine works, His communications with angels, His ineffable deeds of love, would not his mind have been readily accessible, first, to all the doubts respecting the Son of man, and then to the most unjust thoughts and the most erroneous notions, till he confounded Him with ordinary men, and, perhaps, in a short time, with impostors?

Now, just such is the danger which threatens, in different degrees, as to the written Word, men who are occupied in studying that Word only under the human forms that invest it, and in its literary accidents, without taking the precaution to submit, at the same time, their inner man to the influences of the Word itself. They also, losing their reverence for it, and entertaining erroneous

[1] Fifty-eight years old at the Saviour's death. This event happened in the thirty-third or thirty-fourth year of what is called the Christian era, and Jesus was then thirty-eight years old; for we know by Matt. ii. 1, that "*He was born in the days of Herod the king*," and by Josephus, that this prince died four years before the Christian era.

[2] Mark iii. 21, 31, 32.

notions respecting it, will at first confound it with ordinary books, and very soon with forgeries. In proportion as they advance more exclusively on the dangerous path, they will have increasing difficulty to admit that this is the Word "of God, quick and powerful," (Heb. iv. 12;) "the lively oracles" of the "living and true God," "sharper than any two-edged sword, dividing asunder the joints and marrow;" that incomparable power which created the Church and renovates the world. If, then, you behold these persons end in seeing only discordant and faulty documents, in which it is necessary to separate the chaff from the wheat, do not be surprised, but rather say with us, that if such is too often the result, such, certainly, is always the danger of this method when too exclusively followed.

CHAPTER III.

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE METHOD OF FAITH.

416. THE method of faith, on the contrary, by requiring you to study profoundly the divine facts recorded in the Word in order to find your proofs, far from giving birth to doubts in your progress, will every day increase your motives for gratitude, and furnish fresh subjects of admiration. Instead of taking no notice of the constant agency of God in the Church, as you are constrained to do by the other method,—instead of dispensing with the promises of Christ to His people, and His powerful interventions to give them the Bible, and to preserve or to restore it,—instead of dispensing with this very simple argument, that the canon of the Old Testament never had a history, and yet all the saints before Jesus Christ had good reasons for receiving it as divine,—instead of putting aside the superhuman effects which these holy books have accomplished in the world through every age, rendering themselves a testimony of what they are ;—this method of faith, far from regarding as nothing these testimonies of God, contemplates and admires them, and, while confirming the canon to you in so many ways, at the same time establishes your soul on "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," (Eph. ii. 20.) This method of faith contemplates the incessant and manifestly divine agency which for twenty-three centuries made use of the Jewish people, though almost always rebellious, to preserve the canon of the Old Testament free from all admixtures. He who guarded it for twenty-three centuries, it tells you, will not fail to guard the canon of the New Testament to the end by the Christian Church. He, of whom it is said, after

His ascension to heaven, that He still "laboured with His apostles" in their most distant proclamations of the gospel, "working with them, and confirming the word with signs following," (Mark xvi. 20,)—He is not dead! No! it is "He who is alive," (Rev. i. 18;) and if He has promised to be with them to "the end of the world," (Matt. xxviii. 20,)—that is, not with their persons, but no doubt with their testimony, and consequently with their books,—He has not failed, and will not fail, to keep His promise, by defending His Church against the gates of hell; nor will He allow those gates to prevail against the sacred books which have given it birth, and which sustain its life. How can the elect be saved if they do not believe? the method of faith asks; and how can they believe if the truth is not preached? and how can the truth be preached if the books which contain it are not given to us? and how can they be given if they are not preserved? God, then, in promising that His Church shall never perish, promises also that His word shall never pass away. Sooner should heaven and earth pass away!

Such are the thoughts and the confident expectations of faith in relation to the canon.

417. In the foregoing lines we have somewhat anticipated what must be demonstrated in the sequel, as far as relates to what we call the scriptural doctrine of the canon; but we wish only to make it understood that this method of faith, the simplest and the shortest for establishing the certainty of the canon, is also unquestionably the most beneficial and the surest.

Yet, before coming to this doctrine, we must state what appears to us the true and legitimate use of science in the determination of the canon.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TRUE USE OF SCIENCE IN RELATION TO THE CANON.

418. THE legitimate office of historical and critical science in relation to the canon is not so much, as we have said, to lay the foundation of our faith, as to pave the way for it, to accompany, and to defend it. Our faith is otherwise founded—it is established on the declarations of God, and on His works. But when this faith is attacked in the name of science, it belongs to science better informed to reply to science—to undertake the examination of facts, and to shew that, properly handled, far from shaking our confidence, they serve ultimately to confirm it.

For example, faith, relying on the divine testimonies, of which we shall speak presently, receives the firm assurance that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, of which, at the present day, all the churches all over the world offer one and the same collection, must necessarily have been divinely guarded as they were divinely given; for the same Providence, faith asserts, which for thirty-three centuries has miraculously preserved the Old Testament by means of the Jewish people, cannot have taken less care to preserve the books of the New by means of the Christian Church. But, in spite of this primary and living conviction, it may happen to our faith to hear voices claiming to be those of science make this objection,—If it be true that all the churches at the present day offer us the same New Testament, composed of twenty-seven books, and if it be true that twenty of them were never controverted, it is not less true that, before the last fifteen hundred years, seven others were, for a longer or shorter time, not acknowledged by a certain number of churches, will not this

fact, then, shake your confidence, since it strikes at the very principle on which you found it, that is, the testimony of the churches which, according to you, is upheld by God?

To this objection of science faith replies, by requesting it to apply itself to study the facts afresh with more attention; and we think it has been sufficiently shewn in the First Part of this work how, by attesting the freedom, the vigilance, and the holy jealousy of the first Christians in the question of the canon, science retracts, on the contrary, by describing the free and continuous testimony which all the churches have given at last with admirable constancy to the sacred collection of the Scriptures.

Such is, then, its legitimate use in the matter of the canon; a use that even faith requests it to give. It is a use of great importance, but indirect; real, but secondary and apologetic. Called to the useful task of preparing and encouraging our convictions, it is not required to lay their foundation; because it is by arguments of faith that the vital and profound confidence of a Christian soul is established in the sacred collection of our Scriptures.

419. We shall more firmly grasp this thought by comparing the task of historical science with that which other branches of human knowledge fulfil, which have been alike employed to attack the Scriptures or to defend them.

Many apologists have undertaken to prove the divine origin of revelation by its often wonderful agreement with the different discoveries by which mankind have been enriched. For example, one hundred and fifty years ago, the knowledge of manuscripts being yet in its infancy seemed to raise the most menacing objections against the integrity of the New Testament. The various readings of the Greek text, we were told, are counted by myriads, and must fatally shake your confidence in its integrity. What was faith required to do? To appeal from demi-science to science better informed. And so, after an age of Herculean labours, the latter has ended by setting in the clearest light the wonderful insignificance of the various readings taken as a whole, and by confirming, even beyond its first expectation, the preservation of our sacred texts; thus demonstrating that an invisible Power has silently watched over our sacred books, and as the last result their text is found to be much purer than even pious men dared to hope.

And it is this which, in their turn, history, astronomy, philology, anthropology, archaeology, and other branches of human knowledge have done, and will do, in favour of the Scriptures; though they have all been thought capable of opposing them, yet one after the other they have come to render their testimony to the Word of God. Are we to infer from this, that these different sciences are the human foundation of our faith? No, doubtless; but only that each of them, properly interrogated, sufficed to repel the attacks that were attempted to be made in its name. Well, this is precisely what we must say of the science which has been named "The History of the Canon." It can be very useful to us, no doubt, in resolving difficulties which come from the same quarter; but our faith in the sacred collection has another foundation; it appeals to a doctrine. This is the doctrine we now proceed to establish by the divine declarations, and by facts.

BOOK II.

THE DOCTRINE RELATING TO THE CANON.

420. THE doctrine which concerns the canon of Scripture is this —*that God himself has made Himself its guarantee*,—that His almighty providence is engaged for the preservation of this sacred deposit,—that He has guarded, now guards, and will guard it, till heaven and earth have passed away. In more precise terms, it is, that God, by a secret and perpetual agency, watches over His written Word, because He watches over His Church; it is, that He has invisibly, but sovereignly, made use, first, of the Jewish people, during 3350 years, to make them the sure depositaries of the sacred oracles of the Old Testament; and, still later, of Christian people—that is to say, of all Christian churches, good or bad, to make them, in like manner, through fourteen centuries, and to make them to the end, depositaries not less sure of the oracles of the New Testament.

421. This doctrine may be established most firmly, as we think, by six classes of proofs.

(1.) By evident reasons taken from the wisdom of the Most High and His faithfulness.

(2.) By the very simple consideration of what "the God of the holy prophets" has not ceased to do, during more than thirty-three centuries, in relation to the sacred collection of His Scriptures.

(3.) By the infallible testimony borne by the apostles, and the

Son of God himself, to the Old Testament, and to the preservation of His canon.

(4.) By a direct and positive declaration of the Holy Scriptures.

(5.) By the whole assemblage of the facts of Providence, splendid, incontestable, and numerous—facts extending through ages, all of which powerfully attest the sovereign agency of this Divine Providence for the preservation of Moses and the prophets.

(6.) Lastly, by a new assemblage of other facts, not less striking and incontestable, all of which attest, with equal force, the same continued agency of the Most High for the preservation of the New Testament.

CHAPTER I.

THE FIRST CLASS OF PROOFS TAKEN FROM THE WISDOM AND FAITHFULNESS OF GOD.

422. THIS doctrine, we affirm, is already proved, for every one who believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures, by the simple consideration of the divine wisdom and veracity.

This is almost a question of the plainest common sense. Only suppose that a clever watchmaker, by a wonderful exertion of his abilities, prepares and finishes, at a great expense, all the parts of a perfect chronometer, which is intended for the use of a beloved son in his travels to foreign parts; shall we not admit, as we would an axiom, that, having thus made it, he would not intentionally leave it out of doors exposed to all the accidents of the weather, or to injuries from passers-by? And who, then, can admit that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ would cause His only Son to come down from heaven for His chosen people, without guaranteeing for them the record of His life and teachings? or that He would have commissioned His apostles to write their books by the Holy Spirit, without taking care to preserve in after-time so precious a deposit? that He watched over these books while they were being written, and ceased to watch over them when once they were given to the world? that He cared no more about them when the churches had received them from the hands of the apostles? and that, in consequence, they have been transmitted from age to age, from country to country, from one generation to another, abandoned henceforward, like any common book to all the hazards of eighteen centuries? Would such negligence be in harmony with the principles of His government; with

the care which He takes of the Church to the end of time; with His declarations of the value of the Scriptures, and the permanent certainty of their declarations; with His denunciations against the crime of adding anything to them, or taking anything from them? He numbers the hairs of our head, and would He not number the books of His oracles? He does not allow a sparrow to fall to the ground without His permission, and would He allow the Scriptures to fall from heaven to the ground, which have been given by Himself for the universal gathering together of His elect? What good to give them divinely inspired, unless He transmit them divinely guarded? Why preserve them from all error, if not preserved afterwards from all dangers? He who said, "Every word of God is pure, ... add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee,"[1] will He not keep a jealous eye upon it? And if, by the mouth of Paul, He pronounced an anathema against any who should preach "any other gospel than what His apostles preached,"[2] would He afterwards permit this condemnation to fall on the entire collection of their oracles, by allowing inspired writings to be lost from it, or forged writings to be admitted into it? This is not possible. And we must all admit that, the inspiration of the Scriptures being recognised, our doctrine is already proved by the simplest knowledge of the wisdom and veracity of God.

The learned Grotius has developed this thought very ably in the third book of his treatise on the truth of the Christian religion.[3]

[1] Ps. xii. 6, xviii. 30; Prov. xxx. 5, 6.

[2] Gal. i. 8.

[3] Lib. iii., cap. 9:—"Ad haec addo quod, si recipimus curare Deum res humanas et maxime eas, quae ad honorem cultumque suum pertineant; non potest fieri, ut is tantam multitudinem hominum, quibus nihil aliud propositum erat, quam Deum piè colere, passus sit falli mendacibus libris. . . . ." Cap. 15:—"Tum quod de divina providentia attigimus, ad partes praecipuas non minus quam ad totos libros pertinet, et non convenire ut siverit Deus tot millia hominum pietatis studiosa et aeternam salutem sincero proposito quaerentia, induci in eum errorem, quem vitare omninò non possent."

SECTION FIRST.

BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WHICH ARE SAID TO HAVE BEEN LOST.

423. Nor must it be alleged here that books composed, it is said, by prophets of the Old Testament, or by apostles of the New, have been lost—"unfortunately lost"—to speak as some theologians do in the present day.[1] None have been lost; and those persons who have advanced the contrary on mere suppositions can furnish no proof. The Church, for a longer or shorter time, may have suspended her judgment on the canonicity of this or that scripture; but not an instance can be cited of any book that has been once admitted into the canon that it has been afterwards excluded or lost.[2]

424. Such allegations, it is true, have been made as to the Old Testament respecting *The Book of the Wars of Jehovah*,[3] cited in the Pentateuch; *The Book of Jasher*,[4] cited in Joshua and Samuel; also the books of Gad, of Nathan, of Ahijah, of Jeddo, of Semahiah, of Heddo, cited in the Chronicles;[5] and as to the New Testament, a pretended Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, that no one has ever seen, and another pretended Epistle to the Corinthians, which also has not been seen.

425. But to speak first of the Old Testament. *The Book of the Wars of Jehovah* never made part of the Holy Scriptures as a distinct work. The Jews who came after Moses knew it only by the citation of Moses. They have even thought with Aben-Ezra, and some rabbis, that he meant only the Book of Numbers. Lightfoot believed it was a collection of instructions left by Moses to serve Joshua as a guide;[6] others, with Hengstenberg,[7] that it consisted of songs of praises on the wars of Israel; and others, with Calmet, that it was a series of annals written by public persons among the Hebrews, to which, perhaps, at different times,

[1] Even the eminent Dr Olshausen, in his valuable treatise on "The Authenticity of the New Testament," ch. 5, p. 99, of the French translation.

[2] See Prop. 393. [3] Num. xxi. 14. [4] Josh. x. 13; 2 Sam. i. 18.

[5] 1 Chron. xxix. 29; 2 Chron. ix. 29, xii. 15, xiii. 22.

[6] Lightfoot, Chronica Temporum. Opera, i., 37, (Ultrajecti, 1699.)

[7] Die Authent. des Pentat., ii., 225.

the successive titles had been given of *The Book of the Wars of Jehovah, The Book of Jasher, The Book of Days.* But at all events, none of these authors imagined that it was a lost canonical book.

As to *The Book of Jasher*, (the right, the just,) the Jewish Targum explains it of *The Book of the Law;* others of *The Book of the Wars of Jehovah*, or of the Book of Judges; but no Israelite ever imagined that it was a sacred book which "had been lost."

And lastly, as to those of Gad and Nathan—those two prophets who had assisted King David in the difficulties of his reign and in the administration of holy things[1]—they wrote themselves the history of this prince in the sacred book of Samuel, at least from the part where[2] Samuel left it at his death.

Since, then, the scripture itself of the book of Chronicles declares that the history of David contained in the books of Samuel is the work of these two men of God, how can it be maintained that their books are lost?

It is the same as to the history of King Solomon contained in the Book of Kings, and if the Chronicles inform us in like manner that the prophets Nathan and Ahijah wrote it,[3] as Iddo and Shemaiah that of Rehoboam[4] and Jeroboam, why should it be said that their books are lost? Do they not make a part of those scriptures which were deposited in the temple, as Josephus[5] tells us?

426. Yet it will be said that these books, though they were deposited in the temple, have not preserved their distinct individuality, and we possess them at this day mixed in one body of history as Ezra or some other prophet compiled them. This is possible; but what does it signify? Even in that case they would not be lost, since they would be given to us under the form in which the Holy Spirit wished us to have them. And if it be true, which I do not affirm, that Ezra received as a prophet an order to digest their histories, and to combine them with care in one and the same book, called either the Book of Samuel or the Book of Kings, it would be absurd as well as incorrect to say that

[1] 1 Chron. xxix. 29, xxi. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 19, xxix. 25; 1 Kings i. 10, 22; 2 Sam. vii. 2, 4, 17, xxi. 1, 24; xxv. 11, 14, 19. [2] 1 Sam. xxiv.
[3] 2 Chron. ix. 29. [4] 2 Chron. xii. 15. [5] Ant. Jud., v., 11.

their books were "lost," and "unfortunately lost." We possess them as it was proper we should have them—abridged if you please—but, happily, surely and divinely guarded. So much for the Old Testament.

SECTION SECOND.

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WHICH ARE SAID TO HAVE BEEN LOST.

427. As to the New Testament, the fact will be still more simple. First, a letter of Paul to the Laodiceans is alleged to have been lost.

None of the fathers ever saw this pretended epistle, and it never was made a question to insert it in the canon. In the time of Jerome, about the year 400, one universally rejected,[1] he says, had been shewn, and that an impostor had forged it to correspond with that passage of Paul to the Colossians,[2] where some have wished to find the indication of a letter written by that apostle to the Laodiceans. But "this was too clumsy a fraud," says Calvin, "that I know not what cheat could dare, under this covert, to counterfeit and put forth a letter as written by St Paul to the Laodiceans, and, withal, so silly and ridiculous, that we know not how anything could be forged more opposite to the spirit of St Paul."[3]

But this is not all; for, besides that no father professes to have seen Paul's true epistle, Paul himself never said that he had written one; and "those persons," Calvin adds, "have doubly deceived themselves who have thought that Paul actually wrote to the Laodiceans."

Paul, in that passage, satisfies himself with recommending the Colossians *to read the epistle coming from Laodicea,* (*τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας,*)—that is to say, according to Calvin, "an epistle which had been sent from Laodicea to Paul, and which he thought it desirable to be read by the Colossians;" or, according to others, an epistle written by Paul, which was to be passed from Laodicea to Colosse. And what epistle? Very plainly, without doubt,

[1] In Catal.—"Ab omnibus exploditur."

[2] Col. iv. 16.

[3] Comment. sur Coloss., tom. iv., p. 107. Paris, 1855.

that which he had writen at the same time to the Ephesians, and which, not being addressed to "the elders and deacons" of that city, was rather, as many think, an encyclical epistle.

428. But another epistle has been alleged. Many have imagined, from some equivocal expressions of Paul to the Corinthians, that this apostle,[1] antecedently to his two canonical epistles, wrote another, which has been "unfortunately lost," or which, at least, not having been destined to make a part of the sacred oracles, would never have been inserted in the canon. This letter, we reply, was never lost, because it never existed. It is true that, in this instance, a more modern impostor, availing himself of these words of Paul, has attempted to fabricate one, of which we shall say nothing, because it has never obtained the least credit, and the anachronisms found in it demonstrate the imposture. Besides, no father ever said that he *had seen* this pretended epistle of Paul which is said to have been "lost."

429. The fact is, that the very simple meaning of the apostle's words has been misunderstood.

"I have written to you in this epistle," he says to the Corinthians, "not to company with fornicators."

He does not say, as some translators have incorrectly rendered it, "I have written to you in *an* epistle," but "in *the* epistle, (ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ,)"—that is to say, "in *this* epistle," for this is the form of the definite article used by the Greeks for the demonstrative pronoun;[2] and it is thus all the translators have understood the same expression in the four other passages where it occurs in the New Testament.

Rom. xvi. 22: "I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, (ὁ γραψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν.)" It is, "who wrote *the* epistle."

Col. iv. 16: "And when this epistle (ἡ ἐπιστολὴ, *the* epistle) is read amongst you."

1 Thess. v. 27: "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle (τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, *the* epistle) be read unto all the holy brethren."

2 Thess. iii. 14: "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, (διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, by *the* epistle,) note that man."

[1] 1 Cor. v. 9.

[2] On this subject see Bishop Middleton's admirable work on the use of the article in the New Testament.

"I have written to you (or I write—ἔγραψα) in this epistle," says the apostle, "not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world . . . . for then ye must needs go out of the world; but now I have written (or I write—ἔγραψα) unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother," &c.

We see that the apostle does not oppose what he writes now to what he had written in a preceding letter. He does not oppose one tense of the verb to another, not γράφω to ἔγραψα,—the aorist ἔγραψα is used in the two successive members of the sentence, which are by no means adversative, the second being only a development of the other, and the aorist of this verb being freely used elsewhere in a present sense.[1]

Paul recalls to the Corinthians the occasion of the scandal of *which he has spoken to them here for the first time.* He had just exhorted them in this same epistle (eight verses before) not to have familiar intercourse with men who, while making a profession of Christianity, led immoral lives:—"It is reported commonly that there is such uncleanness among you as is not named amongst the Gentiles. And yet ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. But I, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, have judged to deliver such an one to Satan; . . . . therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Then, four verses lower, and without quitting the subject, he adds, "I have written in this epistle not to company with fornicators. But now I write to you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother," &c.

Such, then, is the perfectly natural sense of this passage, without there being any question either of a preceding epistle or a "lost epistle."

430. Do we mean to say by this, that Paul, burdened every day with continual care for all the churches, did not write, either to the brethren or to the churches, other letters besides the fourteen epistles in the New Testament during the thirty years of his ministry? Doubtless he did, but "the Lord," Calvin remarks, "has

[1] "Εγραψα is often applied by the apostle to what he has just written. See 1 Cor. ix. 15; Philem., 19, 21; 2 Cor. ii. 3; Gal. vi. 11; also 1 John. ii. 14.

by His providence consecrated as a perpetual memorial those which He knew were necessary for His Church; and, however little there may be, this was not a matter of chance, but by the wonderful counsel of God the volume of Scripture has been formed as we have it."[1]

We see, then, even the words really inspired of the apostles and prophets, even those of Jehovah, when He conversed with Moses on the mountain or in the desert, those even of the Son of God speaking to His most beloved servants in the most important hours of His ministry, (Luke xxiv. 27, Matt. xvii. 3,) have not been preserved for us. But is this a loss for the Church? We think not; since it has not been the will of God to give them to her. It was needful that the number of those He reserved for her should be reduced to wise proportions. "The world could not have contained all that it would have been possible to reveal," (John xxi. 25;) and the Gospels required to be very brief. Not every acorn that falls from an oak produces an oak; but enough remain for God's purposes. His holy Word is also a seed; it has been sown in due measure, and has given us all we ought to have.

431. Yet it must not be imagined that all the discourses or writings of an Isaiah or a Daniel, of a Peter or a Paul, during a ministry of thirty years like that of the apostles, of sixty years like that of Isaiah, or of ninety years like that of Daniel, were from morning to evening under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. We believe we have established this fact elsewhere by sufficient quotations.[2] These prophets and apostles were inspired at certain times, determined by God, and for certain objects; but out of these times, and apart from these objects, they were not always inspired. God has not guaranteed to us all the words of Paul in his disputes with Barnabas, nor all the parchments he left with Carpus, (2 Tim. iv. 13.) What is guaranteed to us is the Holy Scripture—"all scripture divinely inspired," (*πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος.*) But beyond this spoken or written theopneustia, which in these men of God was like their other charisms, an intermittent grace, they were, without doubt, most frequently enlightened and directed from on high, as may be the case with

[1] Commentary on Eph. iii. 3.

[2] Theopneustia, chap. iii., sect. i., quest. 12, 13, p. 113, (Scott's trans.)

simple believers in the present day; but they no longer spoke as "borne away and impelled" by the Holy Spirit, and what they uttered, though always deserving the most respectful attention, was no longer infallible.

432. There is, then, nothing lost of the books that God designed to give us by His prophets—nothing of the canon of the Scriptures. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not one iota of His holy Word shall ever pass away, (Matt. v. 18.)

Yet there is another class of proofs for the doctrine of the canon, still more simple and manifest—those arising from the consideration of what has been done during a long course of ages for the Old Testament.

CHAPTER II.

THE SECOND CLASS OF PROOFS FOUNDED ON THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

433. Do you wish for a demonstration, at once the most powerful and the simplest, of the sovereign Providence which watches over the canon; and of the profound conviction on this point maintained by all the saints, prophets, and apostles, and by the Son of God himself? Observe what has occurred during thirty-three centuries in reference to the sacred oracles of the Old Testament.

We shall make this proof apparent to all Christian readers, by simply bringing under their notice three or four incontestable facts.

SECTION FIRST.

THE ASTONISHING AND IMMOVABLE UNANIMITY OF THE JEWS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE CANON.

434. The perfect and constant preservation of the canon for thirty-three centuries and a half is a most astonishing fact in the history of Israel, not less wonderful than that of the preservation of this race of Abraham, which has maintained itself for three thousand one hundred and eighty years in the midst of the nations as a single family, infusible and indestructible.

From the time of Moses to our own day, we have beheld among this singular people, in spite of all their sins and awful calamities, a constant unanimity in acknowledging, without any variation, the sacred collection of their Scriptures during its gradual formation, and the entire collection since its completion—that is to say, for

thirty-three centuries. This canon, which our Bibles divide into thirty-nine portions, but which the Jews are accustomed to arrange in twenty-two [1] books, as the ancient fathers [2] also did after them —this canon, we say, was completed 400 years before Jesus Christ, and has never ceased to be read since that epoch in all their synagogues throughout the world as "The Book of God." The nation of the Jews, even before their final catastrophe, was spread over all the countries then known. "Moses," said St James, speaking of the Gentiles, "of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day," (Acts xv. 21.) "We see no Grecian cities, and scarcely any cities of the barbarians," says also the historian Josephus, "where the rest of the Sabbath is not observed through the influence of the Jews." [3]

That all these Israelites received the same canon of the Scriptures with the most perfect unanimity, is a fact abundantly attested by Jews who were contemporaries of the apostles—Philo in Egypt, and Josephus in Egypt and Rome. And there is, besides, another fact universally admitted, that, a very long time before the apostolic age, the Old Testament, both in Hebrew and Greek, existed in its twenty books, just as we now possess it.

435. The testimony of Josephus is worthy of being repeated here; for this historian was only thirty years old at the death of St Paul. "Nothing," he says to Apion,[4] "can be better attested than the writings authorised among us. In fact, they were never subject to any difference of opinion, (*μήτε τινὸς ἐν τοῖς γραφουμένοις ἐνούσης διαφωνίας,*) for only that has been approved among us which the prophets, many ages ago taught, as they were, by the inspiration of God, (*κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθόντων.*) It is, therefore, impossible to see among us, as among the Greeks, a vast multitude of books disagreeing, and combating one another, (*οὐ μυριάδες βυβλίων εἰσὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀσυμφώνων καὶ*

[1] To correspond with the twenty-two letters of their alphabet, (see Prop. 59,) they thus reduce by seventeen our ordinary enumeration of their sacred books, by their mode of classifying them.

[2] Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, John Damascenus, Jerome, Gregory of Nazianzus, Epiphanius, &c. "Quomodo viginti duo elementa sunt per quae scribimus Hebraice omne quod loquimur," says Jerome, in his Prologus Galeatus, (tom. i., p. 318, Bened., Paris, 1693,) "ita viginti duo volumina supputantur."

[3] Contra Apion., ii., 9. [4] Ibid., i., 2.

μαχομένων.) *We have only twenty-two,* which comprehend all that has taken place among us, and which we have just grounds for believing, (καὶ δικαίως πεπιστευμένα.) *Five* are by Moses. The prophets who came after Moses have written, in *thirteen* other books,[1] what has transpired since his death, to the reign of Artaxerxes; . . . . while the *four* other books[2] contain hymns in praise of God, and precepts for the regulation of manners. Moreover, all that has happened since Artaxerxes to our own time, has been written; but, because there has not been an exact succession of prophets, these books have not been thought worthy of the same faith as those that preceded them, (πίστεως δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίας ἠξίωται ταῖς πρὸ ἑαυτῶν.)

"But it is sufficiently manifest by these facts to what extent we have given our faith to our own Scriptures (πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἰδίοις γράμμασι πεπιστεύκαμεν;) for, although so many centuries have already passed away, no person has ever dared to add, or to take away, or transpose anything, (οὔτε προσθεῖναι τίς οὐδέν, οὔτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν, οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν;) and it has been as an innate thought for all the Jews, (πᾶσι γὰρ σύμφυτον,) from the first generation, or, from their very birth, (εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως,) to call them *the doctrines of God,* (Θεοῦ δόγματα,) to abide by them, and, if necessary, to die cheerfully for them, (καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν, εἰ δέοι, θνήσκειν ἡδέως.)"

This testimony clearly shews that, in the time of Josephus, the whole Bible was composed of the same twenty-two books as for the modern Jews, or the thirty-nine books for ourselves; and that, to whatever set they belonged, and wherever they erred, the Jews never betrayed the least disagreement respecting their sacred canon; that the most familiar, or the most historical books of the Bible—Ruth, Esther, or Nehemiah, as well as the Psalms of David, or the visions of Isaiah were, in their eyes, alike written *by the succession of the prophets,* (διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν διαδοχήν,) *and under the inspiration which comes from God,* (κατὰ τὴν ἐπιπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ,) and were alike

[1] Namely—(1.) Joshua; (2.) Judges, with Ruth; (3.) Samuel; (4.) Kings; (5.) Chronicles; (6.) Ezra and Nehemiah; (7.) Esther; (8.) Job; (9.) Isaiah; (10.) Jeremiah and his Lamentations; (11.) Ezekiel; (12.) Daniel; (13.) The Twelve Minor Prophets.

[2] Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs.

called *the doctrines of God*, (*Θεοῦ δόγματα*;) that, lastly, this common conviction was through all ages so inherent in the very existence of the Israelitish nation, that it might be said to be born with *them from their first generation*, (*σύμφυτον*,) and that they were always *ready to die rather than renounce it*.

And what Josephus said 1800 years ago, may be asserted equally of the modern Jews, from the siege of Jerusalem by Titus to our own days.

SECTION SECOND.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES TO THE CANON.

436. Yet another divine fact still more worthy of all our attention is, that the apostles shared in this full and perfect confidence of the Jewish people in reference to the canon. These men of God, commissioned by the Holy Spirit to announce His eternal truth to the whole world, to bind and loose, to discern spirits, and to become themselves, as apostles and prophets, "the twelve foundations of His universal Church,"—these men of God never ceased to regard the twenty-two books of the Old Testament as constituting a unique whole—an entire whole, sacred and perfect, which they denominated *the Scripture, the Word of God, the Oracles of God*, and of which they said, "All Scripture is inspired by God;" "all the prophets who wrote it had in them the spirit of Christ;" "all the Old Testament is a written prophecy," (*προφητεία γραφῆς*;) "God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began."

This fact, so highly important, comes then to sanction, in its turn, the unanimous and invariable testimony which the Jews have always borne to their canon; and we must, therefore, soon apply ourselves to examine what was the real foundation of this absolute confidence of the apostles and the Israelitish nation in the perfect integrity of the Old Testament. But before we come to that, there is another still more significant fact, which demands our most devout attention, since it tends to impress, more than any other, on the canon of the scriptures of the Old Testament a divine character of infallibility.

SECTION THIRD.

THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS CHRIST.

437. The incomparable fact to which we now appeal, is the belief of our Redeemer himself respecting the Scriptures; it is the judgment of Emmanuel, "the God of the holy prophets;" it is His whole conduct in reference to the canon. By Him its integrity or legitimacy was never questioned; by Him the least hesitation was never manifested as to the Divine authenticity of any of the twenty-two books of which it consisted; He cited all, or nearly all, with His own lips. Who shall discern the spirits of the prophets, if not He whose eternal Spirit animated them all?[1] Who shall better inform us whether such a book is of God, or whether it is of man? "The chief Shepherd of the sheep, by the blood of the everlasting covenant," came in His own person to dwell among men, and who shall better distinguish than He the voice of His own messengers from that of strangers and robbers?[2]

He was heard Himself preaching these scriptures; He was seen taking from the hands of the Jews in their synagogues the sacred roll which they "delivered to Him,"[3] and unfolding it before all, He cried, "In the volume of the book it is written of me!" He was heard crying at the feast, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life."[4] He was even seen to expound them from one end to the other, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded to them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself."[5] Did He ever suppose the least alteration on the part of the Jews? Never. He reproached them with having continually resisted this divine book, but never with having altered it. God suffered them to commit all crimes excepting this. They rejected Jehovah—they committed abominations with their infamous gods, and made their children pass through the fire; but they never made themselves chargeable with the much easier crime of altering the Scriptures, and foisting in spurious books.

Christ's whole career as the Son of man, attests that no human teacher ever held the Sacred Volume in greater reverence. Which-

[1] 1 Pet. i. 11. [2] John x. 5, 8. [3] Luke iv. 17, 21.
[4] John v. 39. [5] Luke xxiv. 27, 44.

ever of the sacred books He cites, it is for Him always God who speaks; this scripture is the rule of His life. It is by the whole of this book that He regulates His holy humanity, and that He wishes us to submit our own, in order to be saved. The least word of this book possesses in His eyes an authority of greater permanence than the heavens and the earth. When He wishes to convince the Sadducees and Pharisees, at one time He proves the resurrection by a single word from Exodus;[1] at another, the true doctrine of marriage by a single word from Genesis;[2] at another, His own divinity by a single word from the 110th Psalm, or by another word from the 82d Psalm; and yet, before pronouncing this word, He interrupts Himself to exclaim, "And the scripture cannot be broken, (*καὶ οὐ δύνατοι ἡ γραφὴ λυθῆναι.*)"[3] At the commencement of His ministry, He knew all these scriptures without having studied them.[4] In His conflict with Satan He combats him by citing them three times with this simple and powerful formula—"*It is written.*" When He closes His ministry on the cross, He quotes the twenty-second psalm, and when He recommences it for some days after His resurrection, He still expounds the series of sacred books, "beginning at Moses,[5] and continuing through all the prophets and the psalms." In a word, He has cited as from God, Genesis,[6] Exodus,[7] Leviticus,[8] Numbers,[9] Deuteronomy,[10] the Book of Samuel,[11] of Kings,[12] of Jonah,[13] and of Daniel.[14] He has cited Isaiah,[15] Hosea,[16] Jeremiah.[17] He has cited as from God,[18] Psalms viii., xxi., xxv., xxxi., xli.,

[1] Exod. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 32.
[2] Matt. xix. 4; Gen. i. 27.
[3] Matt. xx. 43; John x. 27, 35.
[4] John vii. 15.
[5] Luke xxiv. 27.
[6] Matt. xix. 4; Mark x. 6.
[7] Matt. xxii. 32, 37, v. 21, 27, 38, xv. 4; Mark vii. 10, xii. 26.
[8] Matt. v. 22, 43, xxii. 39; Mark xii. 31; John xiii. 34.
[9] Matt. v. 33; John iii. 14; Matt. xii. 5.
[10] Mark xii. 29; Luke x. 7, 27; John viii. 5, 7.
[11] Matt. xii. 3; Mark ii. 25; Luke vi. 24; John xii. 34.
[12] Matt. xii. 42; Luke xi. 31, iv. 25, 26, 27, ix. 54.
[13] Matt. xii. 40; Luke xi. 32.
[14] Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14; Luke xxi. 20, 22.
[15] Matt. xiii. 14, xv. 7, 8, 30, xi. 5, xxi. 13; John xii. 40; Mark iv. 12, vii. 6, xi. 17; Luke viii. 10, iv. 12, xix. 46.
[16] Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7; Luke xix. 46.
[17] Matt. xxi. 13; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46.
[18] Matt. iv. 6, xv. 34, xxi. 16, xxii. 44; John xv. 25, 35, x. 34, xix. 24, 28, xiii. 18; Luke xxii. 21, xxiii. 46, iv. 10, x. 17, xix. 38; Mark iv. 12, vii. 6, xv. 17.

lxix., lxxviii., lxxxii., xci., cx., and cxviii., and cites them, saying, "Have ye not read these words of David, saying by the Spirit?" "Have ye not read what God said by the mouth of David?"

We see, then, what was our Master's firm belief respecting the canon of the Old Testament. We have before us His science on this question. We have His sacred criticism: it involved the reception of all the sacred books of the Jews; it called them all in detail, and as a collection, THE LAW;[1] it declared that heaven and earth should pass away, but not one jot or tittle of the law should pass till all be fulfilled.[2]

SECTION FOURTH.

FIRST INFERENCE RELATIVE TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

438. Christians! what do you infer from this, except to receive it as your Master received it? We must either rank ourselves among His scholars, or cease to bear His name; and when a student of the Scriptures examines in the schools of theology whether he should acknowledge as canonical such or such a book of this holy law, which his Master acknowledged, he will act a more logical, and, at the same time, more honourable, part, to examine whether he will acknowledge Jesus Christ, and continue to call himself a Christian.

439. Supported, then, by this Divine authority, we assert not only that the ancient people of the Jews, when they received so unanimously their sacred collection of twenty books, were in the right, since Christ himself—God manifest in the flesh—received them all as canonical, but further, that this astonishing and perpetual unanimity of the Jewish people must have had a Divine cause, and was founded on the power as well as on the promise and faithfulness of God. "We know what we worship," said Jesus Christ, speaking of the Jews, "and they are they who gave us the Scriptures; for salvation is of the Jews," (John iv. 22;) and "unto them were committed the oracles of God," (Rom. iii. 2.) In worshipping God according to the whole canon of their Scriptures, the Jews therefore "knew what they worshipped, and salvation for the world was of them."

[1] John x. 34, xii. 34; Rom. iii. 14. [2] Luke xvi. 17; Matt. v. 18; Luke xxi.

440. And now, whence could come this marvellous agreement of a whole people, in other respects almost always rebellious, to receive and maintain without the slightest variation one sole canon of Scripture, a unanimous agreement through 3300 years? Certainly it could come only from God. But at the same time, under this Divine agency, there must have been a common thought, an intelligent principle in reference to the canon, among this people, on which was founded the certainty of all classes—of the little and the great, of the wise and the simple, of the great Sanhedrim that solemnly reported to their king the prophecy of Micah,[1] as well as that of the humblest synagogue,—the certainty of the poorest Jews of the dispersion at Berea "searching the Scriptures daily (*τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφάς*)" to see whether Paul's discourses were conformable to them,[2] as well as that of the pious Israelitish mother, married to a Greek in Asia Minor, but aided herself by her venerable mother, who brought up her little son (*ἀπὸ βρέφους*) in the knowledge of the true God, by making him learn the Holy Scriptures every day, (2 Tim. iii. 15.)

But this common thought of certainty among all this people, what could it be? We shall soon prove that it was a doctrine; and that the minds of the Israelitish nation rested, by its means, on the character of God, on His promises, and His faithfulness.

441. And let it be carefully observed, that this could not be a knowledge of the history of the canon, such as we have been able to present for the New Testament in the First Part of the present work. By no means. The canon of the Old Testament had no history. The Hebrews, in the time of Jesus Christ, possessed no literary monuments besides those which the Holy Scripture itself can still offer to the men of our own time. Josephus, in his History of the Jews, indicates none. It was, therefore, impossible for any one to demonstrate the authenticity of the sacred books by such documents as modern criticism employs for the New Testament. The holy books were of too high antiquity to present a contemporaneous literature, or even a literature of many ages after them. The writings of the ancient Greeks, cited by Josephus, were too recent to have anything to say of weight;

[1] Matt. ii. 6. [2] Acts xvii. 11.

while those of the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Persians had no religious relation to the sacred literature of the Hebrews. There was no document by which to judge the Old Testament but the Old Testament itself. But who could tell, in the time of Josephus and the apostles, any more than at the present day, by what human means Moses provided for the guardianship of his books after they had been placed by the Levites "in the side of the ark of the covenant?" (Deut. xxxi. 25.) By means of the priests, Josephus seems to believe;[1] but who can affirm it? What prophet wrote the last particulars in the Pentateuch; the death of Moses; his burial; the long mourning that followed; and the ignorance, which has never been removed, respecting his sepulchre; and the declaration, "that there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses?" (Deut. xxxiv. 10.) Joshua, do you say? It may be so; but who can affirm it? Again, what prophet was the writer of the sacred book of Job? Job himself? Moses? Elihu? Solomon? Isaiah? Ezekiel? Esra? Each of them has been named, and may have been, the author; but who can affirm it? And who wrote the book of Joshua? and of Judges? and of Ruth? Daniel has been named.[2] This also may be true; but who can affirm it? And the books of Samuel, of Kings, of Chronicles, of Esther, of Jonah? For Esther, some have named Mordecai, others Nehemiah, others Malachi. It has been thought that the history of Solomon and of his successors may have been the work of Nathan, of Ahijah, of Shemaiah, or of Iddo.[3] Esra, especially, has been often spoken of for the books of Kings and Chronicles. But still, who can affirm it? And as to the Psalms —if we know that, at least, 71 were by David, (without speaking of the 2d and 95th;) if we know that there is one by Moses, one by Heman, one by Ethan, twelve by Asaph, and eleven by the sons of Korah, who shall teach us the author of the anonymous psalms. In a word, no one can tell what prophets put the last hand to the twenty books of the Old Testament, to leave them to us in that state in which the Church of God has possessed them for twenty-three centuries. Esra has been often mentioned;

[1] Contra Apion., lib. i., cap. ii.

[2] Particularly on account of 1 Chron. xxix. 29, and Acts. iii. 24.

[3] 2 Chron. ix. 29, xii. 15, xiii. 22.

and even the rabbins, as well as Jerome,[1] have made this prophet and Malachi to be one and the same person. But who can found anything on these surmises?

And if you do not know the authors of all these scriptures, it ought to satisfy you entirely to be able to say, with Jesus Christ, that they were *the prophets*.[2] Much less do you know how they passed from the hands of the authors into those of the nation. You are equally ignorant what interval, more or less, elapsed between the year of their first appearance in the Jewish Church, and that of the universal assent, which they afterwards obtained. Was there not under the Old Testament, for many of these writings, what was seen, at a later period, under the New, for the smaller late epistles of James and Jude, Peter and John —I mean a time, longer or shorter, of examination, the days of *homologoumena* and *antilegomena*, until the final adhesion of the whole nation, given under the care and sanction of God, given freely, and without resumption?

All these elements of a science of the canon were then wanting to the Church of the Old Testament. But they did not even ask for them; they knew better than all that. They firmly believed in the canonicity of all these books, because their security was established on something totally different from the decisions of human schools. They founded it on the declarations of God, on His character, and on His acts. They believed that these scriptures were all guarded by God, because they had been given by God. One of these miraculous facts served as a guarantee for the other; and they all believed that the Lord had pledged Himself to preserve them, since He had given them for the revelation of His glory, and the gathering together of His elect. In a word, if you had lived as a believer in the days of Jesus Christ, you must have believed, like all the Jews, and like your Master himself, in the canon of the Scriptures. And if you had doubted of this canon, Jesus would have said to you, as He did to the Sadducees—"Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God?" (Mark xii. 24.)

[1] Praefat. ad Malach.

[2] See Theopneustia, ch. ii., sect. 3.

Section Fifth.

THE SECOND INFERENCE, RELATING TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

442. From these facts and primary inferences, which have just presented themselves to us with so much evidence in relation to the Old Testament, the most complete, legitimate, and necessary analogy will soon lead us to acknowledge that it must be absolutely thus with the New Testament; and that what constitutes, as to its canon, the true security of a Christian, when he has perceived, by his own experience, the Divine power of the Scriptures, will be much more faith than science; more a doctrine than a history; much more the faithfulness of God than quotations from the Fathers, and all the documents of Christian antiquity.

443. And how, in fact, should it be otherwise? If the Old Testament has been preserved by God for thirty-four centuries by the continual agency of an invisible Providence, to be transmitted in its integrity from generation to generation by the nation which was divinely charged with this deposit, can we admit that the New Testament has had less care taken of it? Would it be less precious in the eyes of its Author? and is it not much more so, if possible? Has not God moved heaven and earth to give it to us? Has He not destined it to transmit to us the very words of His only Son? Were "the apostles and prophets," who were commissioned to write it, inferior to those of the Old? On the contrary, they were far superior. Their ministry was more illustrious and miraculous than that of Isaiah and Elisha; they were "more than prophets," Jesus Christ tells us; and the God of the second Pentecost did greater things than the God of the first. In a word, the Scripture, whenever it institutes any comparison between the writers of the two Testaments, only does it to put the latter above the former; to exalt their charisms and their works; and asserts that, even in the kingdom of heaven, they will be placed on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, (Matt. xix. 28.)

444. If, then, it has been clearly proved that God has never ceased, by the secret but sovereign agency of His Providence, to

make invariably faithful on this point the people who, above all others, were the most unruly and inconstant—we ask, is it possible to believe that this same God has not done as much for His New Testament, which He willed to do for so many ages, and still continues at the present day to do, for the Old? This cannot be admitted. Who can suppose that He has guarded the books of Moses and the prophets for fifteen hundred years anterior to the coming of Jesus Christ, and then for nineteen centuries more down to our own day, and, having prosecuted this amazing work for one of the Testaments, has not done it for the other,—that He has changed His method for the latter, which continues the former—for the latter, still more precious, which explains, completes, and consummates the first. Again, we say, this is impossible.

445. And let no one say that this difference exists between the two covenants and their respective canons—that in the one God has proceeded by miraculous methods, but employs in the other agents more spontaneous and means more natural. It is by no means so. His government, which is carried on by prodigies only at the epochs of new revelations, has, on the contrary, shewn itself more miraculous in the latter than in the ancient; for "if the ministration of the law was glorious, the ministration of the Spirit," St Paul says, "is much more glorious," (2 Cor. iii. 8, 9;) and the second scriptures were brought into the world by dispensations more excellent and more striking than the first. If in those "God at sundry times and in divers manners spake by the prophets, he has spoken to us in these last days by his Son, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, who upholds all things by the word of his power," (Heb. i. 1–3.) And these scriptures, given by the Son and by those who had heard Him, God giving them witness by the distribution of His Spirit according to His will—were these scriptures to be less protected than the others? Far from us be such a thought! In order to give them to us, the "Word was made flesh." He quitted the glory He had with the Father before the world was, and when He humbled Himself to take the form of the Son of man, the heavenly host rendered Him adoration by their songs. Angels were seen to ascend and descend upon Him; several times the

voice of the Father was heard pointing Him out to the world; the tomb could not hold Him; and His apostles, after having conversed with Him forty days, saw Him reascend to heaven. Thus "the great mystery of godliness, God himself manifested in the flesh, was seen of angels, believed on in the world, and received up into glory." From that time He appeared very often to His apostles, in the course of the sixty years of their ministry, to assist them—at Damascus, at Cæsarea, at Jerusalem, at Corinth, and at Patmos.[1] When He commissioned them to "teach all nations," He promised to be with them—that is, with their testimony and their scriptures—even to the end of the world.[2] The Holy Spirit also rested on each of them as with tongues of fire. They were even endowed with an unheard-of privilege, which never belonged to the most illustrious of the ancient prophets; they, and they alone, were able, during a ministry of from thirty to fifty years, to cause, by the imposition of their hands, miraculous *charisms* to descend on the believers who immediately followed them, and who were the first to transmit to us the scriptures of the New Testament,[3] (Acts viii. 17, 19; Gal. iii. 2.)

446. Let any one say, after all this, whether it can be admitted that the collection of these books, given with such prodigies, was not guarded by God from age to age, when it has been clearly proved that the Old Testament had never ceased to be so; let any one say whether it can be admitted that God watched miraculously over the Jews of the dispersion, to maintain their testimony unalterable for ever, and that He did not watch with the same jealousy over the Christian churches, to make them not less faithful guardians of a deposit more miraculous in its origin, and more indispensable in its integrity;—this cannot be allowed.

We must repeat it, then, the divine preservation of the Old Testament being properly established, it becomes a certain pledge of that of the New. For if it is certain that the Old Testament was guarded by power from on high during thirty-three centuries, in order that its canon might remain for ever free from all re-

[1] Acts vii. 56, ix. 5, 10, 17, 34, 48, xviii. 9, 10, xxii. 18, 21, xxiii. 11, xxvi. 15, 16; 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9; Rev. i. 13.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

[3] To this fact the passages relate contained in Acts xix. 2 and John vii. 39. See on this subject Calvin's judicious reflections in his commentary.

trenchment and from all mixture, it must be equally evident to us that the canon of the New can never have ceased to be the object of a vigilance not less admirable and faithful.

447. Therefore, though you knew nothing more respecting the origin of the New Testament or its history than you knew respecting that of the Old,—though, for example, the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius of Cæsarea, which constitutes at least three-fourths of our knowledge upon the canon, had been entirely lost; though we had nothing left of the three or four fathers of the apostolic age, nothing of Origen, nothing of Jerome; and though, finally, we knew not who were the authors of the greater part of the scriptures of the New Testament, as we know not those who wrote at least one-half of the Old;—yet we should have the same reasons of certainty respecting its canon which the Jews, and the apostles, and the Son of God had for the books of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms. In this case, too, our confidence ought to be founded entirely, like theirs, on the principles of faith.

448. The connexion of the two doctrines of the inspiration of the Scriptures by the Holy Spirit, and their miraculous preservation by the secret providence of the same Spirit, is so logically necessary, that a very significant twofold experiment can be made upon it at all times.

In the first place, we have never seen the Church disquiet herself about the canon in her days of living piety, when, feeling the divine power of the Scriptures, she could have no doubt of their inspiration. And, on the other hand, it has always been in her days of languor and death, when not familiar with the Scriptures, that she no longer felt their divine inspiration, that she began to entertain doubts about the canon. So true it is that the integrity of this sacred volume of the Scriptures is a natural and necessary consequence for a Christian persuaded of their inspiration. The reading of this or the other portion of this collection has convinced him of the Divine power concealed in it; for, in converting him, it has made him feel even to the joints and marrow the keenness of this two-edged sword. "Verily," he has said, like Jacob at Bethel, "Jehovah is here!" How venerable is this book! "This is the house of God; this is the gate of heaven!" Henceforward he has felt the powerful impression that such a book cannot have

been given by God for His elect without being likewise preserved by God for them, and that if it was to be preserved from error when it was written, it must also be preserved from error when transmitted. Such is the thought of their faith; while rationalism, a stranger to the power of the Scriptures, will always regard the history of their destinies as uncertain. We may therefore comprehend how, during its reign, the Church, passing through years of languor and disease, will suffer disquietude respecting the authenticity, authority, and integrity of her too long neglected Scriptures, and will necessarily see in her religious literature the triple question reappear of apologetics, inspiration, and the canon. But, on the contrary, the Bible, as long as it is received by churches in a state of vigorous life, is itself the best of apologetics, the most eloquent witness of its own inspiration, and the surest guarantee of its own canon.

449. Another consideration will make us still better comprehend the force and importance of this conclusion of faith for the Christian readers of the New Testament. It is this—that the results of science, even for the New Testament, though very sufficient to *defend* the canon against its adversaries, are very inferior to what they would have been had God destined them to *establish* it; for in that case they must have presented no uncertainty—no link wanting on any point; while it is not so at all. The historical and literary monuments which form all the treasure of this science are, after all, imperfect. They suffice, without doubt, to give us many guarantees for the authenticity of our twenty-seven sacred books, which no literature possesses for the ancient books that are the objects of its study; but these guarantees, so powerful for the *homologoumena*, do not reach, for the five *antilegomena*, the measure which faith can demand; for an intimate and profound certainty is required, which science alone, however respectable it may be in its proper sphere, cannot furnish. Many links, moreover, are wanting in the chain of facts to which it appeals, perhaps even some of the first on which all the rest should depend. It produces, no doubt, very important testimonies from the primitive fathers; but those fathers and their genuine writings are very few. It shews us the apostles watching for thirty years, some for

sixty years, over the innumerable churches founded by them, and transmitting to them these sacred books; but they do not say to what hands they intrusted them, nor what pledges they took that their transmission should be faithfully effected from one church to another. It shews us Peter, at the close of his life, recommending as the scriptures of God "all the epistles of Paul;" but this testimony teaches us nothing directly respecting the writings of Jude, of John, of James, and of Peter himself. It tells us of the original manuscripts which many churches in the time of Tertullian, in the year 207,[1] still preserved of the epistles of Paul to Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Ephesus; but it does not apprise us of analogous facts respecting the other writings of the New Testament. It knows nothing precisely of the way in which the churches adopted the sacred books according as they made their appearance. It attests superabundantly, we allow, that twenty of these books were from the first always accepted everywhere without the least contradiction, and this fact is certainly one of incomparable lustre; but it knows nothing of the mental process by which all hesitation gradually ceased about the seven other books throughout all Christendom. It shews us all the churches in the world constantly agreed for 1500 years in presenting us with one and the same canon of twenty-seven books; but it cannot acquaint us with all that was said before these fifteen centuries among those that hesitated. It tells us, indeed, that John was the Ezra of the New Testament, that is to say, that he collected the different books, and sanctioned their canonisation; but this saying in reference to the apostle, as well as that about Ezra, is only a tradition, which cannot satisfy our faith. Lastly, from these hasty glimpses, which we could multiply, we infer again that if there is no history for the canon of the Old Testament, there exists only an incomplete history for some of the books of the New Testament, and that, consequently, while congratulating ourselves on these important and numerous facts collected by science for the refutation of our opponents, our Christian confidence requires to be settled on a still more solid

[1] Tertull. De Praescript. Haereticor., xxxvi. See Propp. 160, 247.

basis, and on deeper principles of faith, whether as to the Old Testament or even the New.

We pass on, then, to a third class of proofs—the clear declaration of Holy Scripture attesting that the divine conservation of the Old Testament has been confided to the Jewish people, in order that they might be for ever its faithful depositaries.

CHAPTER III.

THIRD CLASS OF PROOFS TAKEN FROM THE DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

450 WHAT God in His wisdom, and in harmony with His other works, needed to do for the constant and perfect preservation of the sacred oracles confided to His people—what all the faithful under the old covenant firmly believed He had done—St Paul declares that He has actually done, and informs us by what means. It was, he says, by means of the Jews; God himself having confided to them for this end, under the invisible government of His providence, the sacred deposit of the Scriptures. It was thus that, by a sovereign and mysterious decree, He constituted this inconstant and wayward people the sure and faithful depositary of His Holy Word. "*Unto them were committed the oracles of God,* (*ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ.*)"

In consequence of this appointment, this people, notwithstanding all their unfaithfulness and misfortunes, carry everywhere with them for thirty-three centuries the Word of the Old Testament inviolate and complete, to the ends of the earth. They always present it to the nations of the world, throughout all ages, in the furthest exiles to which their sins have dispersed them, be it the centre of Africa or in the cities of China. They continue to read it every Sabbath in all their synagogues, and, to preserve it always free from any admixture, they count the books, the chapters, the verses, and even the letters, and by this jealous and unceasing vigilance from age to age, and in the time even of their severest chastisements, they never cease to give to the whole world this unalterable Scripture, every page of which condemns them!

This important declaration is found at the beginning of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans—"What advantage, then, hath the Jew?" The apostle supposes an objector to say, "What is his privilege, since, according to you, all men, Jews as well as Greeks, are under the condemnation of the law?" "*This privilege is much every way,* (*πολυ, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον,*)" he replies, "*but chiefly in this,* (*πρῶτον μὲν,*) *that they were intrusted with the oracles of God,* (*ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ.*)"

Their privilege, according to the apostle, is, then, not only that of possessing the Scriptures, which are the very oracles of God our Saviour, but especially that of having received them as a deposit under the guardianship of God, and thus being divinely charged with their preservation.

It is not said merely that the oracles had been *given* to them, as they have been to us and to so many others, but that they were *intrusted* (*ἐπιστεύθησαν*) with them; so that this nation, though almost always rebellious through the long course of their history—though rejected to this day, and dispersed by the blast of God's wrath, which has "come upon them to the uttermost," St Paul says,[1] and has continued for eighteen centuries,—this nation, "always resisting the Holy Ghost,"[2] as St Stephen said,—this very nation has shewn itself constantly faithful for thirty-three centuries on this single point of the Scriptures: it has guarded and still guards them for ever unaltered! See here the privilege—"the advantage"—of the Jew, (*τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου,*) to use St Paul's words. See it even in our own days. "As your fathers, so are ye." We might say to them, as Stephen did, "Stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and ye are like them." But no matter; still the oracles of God are confided to you, and we may say of you at this day what Augustin wrote a thousand years ago, what is the nation of the Jews, even in our day but, as it were, a keeper of the records for Christians, carrying everywhere the law and the prophets? as a witness of all the Church affirms, ("*Et quid est aliud, hodieque, gens ipsa Judaeorum nisi quœdam scrinaria Christianorum*

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 16. [2] Acts vii. 51, 52.

bajulans Legem et Prophetas ad testimonium assertionis ecclesiae?") [1]

451. Many persons at the first glance may object that our explanation of Paul's language gives at once a more extended and a more definite meaning to it than the expressions allow. But with the evidence of all the facts that we shall bring before our readers, they will feel obliged to acknowledge that this is its legitimate sense and exact intention, and that if the apostle has not expressed himself with greater fulness and precision on this divine preservation of the canon by means of the Jewish people, it is precisely because that doctrine, as we have already shewn, was an object of deep-felt conviction among all the Jews, among all the saints, and prophets, and apostles. It was amply sufficient that the divine fact should be here recalled to mind by these significant words—"Their advantage is much every way, but chiefly that they were intrusted (ἐπιστεύθησαν) with the oracles of God."

452. We shall go even further. When once all the striking and enduring facts that we are about to mention have passed under review, and demonstrated to us the true sense of this sentence of Paul—when once they have firmly established that such is indeed the part assigned by God thirty-three centuries ago to the Jewish nation for the perpetual preservation of the Old Testament—we shall demonstrate that such is equally the part assigned by Heaven to the collective body of Christian churches, good or bad, for the preservation not less perfect of the New Testament. And for this purpose we shall prove, by a fresh assemblage of other facts, not less striking and not less providential, that if the God of Moses and the prophets has set apart the indestructible race of the Jews to be the guardians of His first oracles, the same God, when He was pleased to give His new people the eternal gospel, and the oracles not less imperishable of His new covenant, made use in like manner of the collective body of the Christian churches; so that all of them unanimously, in spite of their differences and angry controversies on so many other points, have presented us for fourteen centuries with the same sacred collection, and have ever been for the New Testa-

[1] Contra Faustum, lib. xii., c. 13.

ment depositaries not less faithful than Israel has been for the Old.

453. Our faith, let us say, once more, possesses for the doctrine of the divine preservation of the canon a fourth and fifth class of proofs, both full of force and beauty. They comprise a twofold assemblage of facts—facts inexplicable apart from a divine intervention—facts tangible, splendid, and permanent.

As these facts relate to each Testament respectively, we shall pass them under review in two successive chapters, confining our notice to the most important.

CHAPTER IV.

FOURTH CLASS OF PROOFS—AN ASSEMBLAGE OF FACTS RELATIVE TO THE OLD TESTAMENT, ATTESTING A DIVINE INTERVENTION IN ITS PRESERVATION BY THE JEWISH NATION.

SECTION FIRST.

THE CONSTANT AND WONDERFUL FIDELITY OF THE JEWS, IN REFERENCE TO THE CANON, FROM MOSES TO JESUS CHRIST.

454. *First Fact.*—It is very remarkable that, from Moses to Malachi, during the course of a thousand years, none of the prophets raised up by God to shew the house of Israel their transgressions ever uttered a single word which could lead to the belief or even the suspicion of the least alteration being made in the Scriptures on the part of the Jews. Every species of crime was committed among them; they were reproached for everything by their prophets excepting for this. This fact, so striking and extraordinary, will appear manifestly providential to any one who will carefully study the history of the Hebrew nation under this aspect. From age to age you will find them a stiffnecked people, uncircumcised of heart and ear, ungrateful, unbelieving, impious idolatrous, rebellious against the Scriptures; but never, never will you see them laying sacrilegious hands on their sacred books; they never questioned their authority; they never mutilated their contents; a hidden, omnipotent hand always preserved them from such conduct. And how can we explain this contrast? Why, on the one hand, were there so many hateful aberrations, and, on the other, such a rigid reserve, such unfaltering fidelity through so many ages? How came it to pass that God, who had allowed

them to take their own course for all other crimes, always checked them from committing this? "*To them were intrusted* (ἐπιστεύθησαν) *the oracles of God!*"

455. *The Second Fact.*—This fidelity was attested by Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ, who so often reproached the Jews for their unbelief in regard to Moses, their blind adherence to the commandments of men and to traditions, by which they made the commandments of God of none effect, (Matt. xv. 6,) their outrages against the prophets, and their murderous madness—Jesus Christ never reproached them for having forgotten, mutilated, or falsified their Scriptures. "They did not believe Moses," He told them, (John v. 45–47;) but they *trusted in Moses*, and for this reason, Moses, "in whom they trusted," while at the same time they remained disobedient to his words, would be their accuser at the last day.

456. *The Third Fact.*—The apostles never accused them of unfaithfulness as to the deposit of the oracles of God with which they had been intrusted.

457. *The Fourth Fact.*—The sovereign Guardian of this imperishable record has been pleased, for the confirmation of our assurance on this point, to furnish us with two irrefragable witnesses—Josephus and Philo—both contemporaries of the apostles, both men of letters, both Pharisees, both descendants of Aaron, both in high repute among their people, and both versed in Hebrew learning, representing at once the mind of the Jews in the East, and of the Jews in the West.[1]

In a controversial treatise against Apion, a grammarian of Alexandria who lived in the midst of the Jews, Josephus enumerates the books that were regarded as divine by all his people. "They maintain them even to death," he says; "none of them dare to add or to take away anything." And he is careful to add that, among these books, there are some more recent, composed since Artaxerxes, (that is to say, after the death of Ezra,) and which are not held to be worthy of the same faith, because (he adds) the exact succession of the prophets who preceded had not been continued since that epoch.

As to Philo, we see him deputed by fifty thousand Jews of Alexandria, to offer prayers and sacrifices at Jerusalem, in the

[1] After the destruction of Jerusalem, Josephus fixed his residence at Rome.

temple of their fathers. He also visited Rome on an embassy to the Emperor Caligula, to defend his countrymen against the accusations of Apion and others; and we hear him declare, that "the Jews would rather die ten thousand times (*μυριάκις αὐτοὺς ἀποθανεῖν*) than permit a single word to be altered in their scriptures, (*μὴ ῥῆμα αὐτοὺς μόνον τῶν γεγραμμένων κινῆσαι*)."

SECTION SECOND.

THE FIDELITY NOT LESS ASTONISHING OF THE JEWS TO THEIR CANON SINCE JESUS CHRIST TO THE PRESENT TIME.

458. *The Fifth Fact.*—From the beginning of the Christian era, for nineteen centuries, never have this people,—in spite of their idolatrous veneration of the Talmud, in spite of their continued state of revolt against God, in spite of their long and distant exiles among pagans, or Mohammedans, or Papists, who have everywhere persecuted them so often, even to death;—never, we say, have this people been convicted of having altered the collection of their scriptures by any retrenchment or any addition. Such is the noble testimony borne to them 1760 years ago by the historian Josephus, in the time of Domitian; and such is the testimony borne to them so many centuries after by all historians and scholars. God has still stretched over them the same powerful hand as in the days of Hadrian or Pompey the Great, of Antiochus Epiphanes or of Nebuchadnezzar. And to accomplish this work of twenty-four centuries, Divine Providence has never ceased to employ, without noise, but effectively, all sorts of means, —the forms of their worship, the labours of their doctors, the rivalship of their sects, the multitude of their synagogues, the precepts even of their Talmud, and their superstitious observances. We shall speak of these elsewhere. But whatever may be thought of all these means, let us admire with what certainty "the oracles of God have been committed to them."

459. *The Sixth Fact.*—It is of universal notoriety, that at the present day, after thirty-four centuries, the Jews, all over the globe, receive only one and the same canon. The astonishing identity of the copies of the Hebrew Scriptures all over the world, presents itself as one of the most astonishing phenomena that the

history of literature and humanity can offer. This fact has been set before the world in the clearest light, in the middle of the eighteenth century, by the researches of Houbigant, in the four folio volumes of his *Biblia Hebraica;* also by the immense labours of John Henry Michaelis;[1] later still, (1776, 1780,) by the great critical edition of the Hebrew Scriptures by Kennicott, exhibiting a collation of 694 manuscripts, which took him twenty-nine years;[2] the labours of Professor Rossi on 731 manuscripts not examined by Kennicott;[3] and, likewise, at the beginning of the present century, the collation, by Yeates, of the famous roll of the Jews of Malabar,[4] with our printed editions of Van der Hooght; and, more recently still, the twelve manuscripts obtained in the centre of China[5] by the Anglican bishop of Hong-Kong, and presented to the Asiatic Society by Sir John Bowring.

When we consider, as we have said elsewhere, that the Bible has constantly been recopied for thirty centuries—that it has passed through all the catastrophes and all the wanderings of the people of Israel—that, transported for seventy years to Babylon, often prohibited, often committed to the flames, since the days of the Philistines to those of the Seleucidae, it has passed, from that time through eighteen centuries of persecution,—certainly, to explain this mysterious preservation, we must have recourse to the declaration of St Paul,—"*to them were intrusted the oracles of God.*"

SECTION THIRD.

THE TEXT COMPARED WITH THE VERSIONS.

460. *The Seventh Fact.*—This divine intervention in the preservation for ages of the canon becomes more striking when we contrast the inviolability of the Hebrew original, during the course of 3000 years, with the rapid deterioration of the versions made from it at different times; because God, though He has pledged

[1] Biblia Hebraica, Halae, 1720, Praefat. He was assisted by twelve members of a *collegium orientale theologicum*, founded in 1702 by Herman Francke.

[2] Dissertatio Generalis, in 600 pages. Brunswick, 1783.

[3] See Rosenmüller, Handbuch, ii., 45.

[4] Consisting of thirty-seven skins died red, obtained, 1808, by Dr Claudius Buchanan, and now deposited in the university of Cambridge.

[5] In Koe-fung-foo, the capital of the province of Hoonan.

Himself to guard the one, has made no promise respecting the others.

461. We notice, first, the deterioration of the Greek version of the LXX.; and then that of the two Latin versions, *the Vetus Itala*, and the *Vulgate* of St Jerome;—great deterioration as to the text, which is often no longer intelligible; and deterioration still more enormous as to the canon, which soon found itself surcharged with nineteen apocryphal books.[1]

462. Though the version of the LXX. had acquired great credit throughout the East, first among the Jews, and then among Christians, this important monument, corrupted at the end of two centuries by the Jews alone, was soon corrupted much more by Christian copyists, some allowing themselves to join the Apocrypha to it, and others transcribing it with increasing carelessness. It is a known fact, that this alteration of the Greek version, which was already considerable in the time of Origen, was made greater by the very labours of this distinguished man. He had devoted twenty-eight years of his life to recover the genuine Greek text; but his marginal notes, in the issue, increased the evil, by finding their way into the version itself, through the unskilfulness of copyists.

463. As to the Latin versions, we know also the history of their enormous alterations. The ancient Italic version (*Vetus Itala*) made, it would appear, in Africa, about the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, but made from the Greek of the Seventy, and not from the original Hebrew, was so completely altered in the time of Jerome, that this father, having laboured for some time at correcting it by the Hexapla of Origen, undertook, towards the close of the fourth century, the great task of retranslating the Old Testament according to the original. This new version, adopted in the West from the seventh century,[2]

[1] (1.) The Prayer of Manasseh; (2. and 3.) The Book of Esdras; (4.) The Conclusion of Job; (5.) A Hundred and Fifty-first Psalm; (6. and 7.) Tobit and Judith; (8.) Additions to Esther; (9.) The Wisdom of Philo; (10.) Ecclesiasticus; (11.) Baruch; (12.) The Epistle of Jeremiah; (13.) Song of the Three Hebrews; (14.) Susanna; (15.) Bel and the Dragon; (16. and 17.) The Two First Books of the Maccabees; (18. and 19.) The Two Latter Books.

[2] Isidor. Hisp., (636;) De Officio Ecclesiae, p. 12. "Hieronymus . . . . cujus editione omnes ecclesiae usquequaque utuntur."

under the name of the Vulgate, was itself soon altered, in proportion as copies of it were multiplied, and likewise by a mixture of readings borrowed from the *Vetus Itala*.[1] In vain, to correct the evil, Cassiodorus, in the sixth century,[2] published the two versions in parallel columns. This remedy only aggravated it, as had been the case with the Greek, through Origen's Hexapla. In vain Alcuin, in the eighth century, exerted himself, by the order of Charlemagne, to procure more correct copies. In vain Archbishop Lanfranc, in the eleventh century, Cardinal Nicholas and others, in the twelfth and thirteenth, laboured for the same purpose, the text was fallen into such confusion that the manuscripts of the Middle Ages differed essentially from the first printed editions.[3] In vain Robert Stephens, in the sixteenth century, published his six critical editions; the doctors of the Sorbonne censured them. In vain the professors of Louvain endeavoured to improve it by their editions of 1547, 1573, and 1586. In vain Pope Sextus V. wished to improve it, by pronouncing as *authentic* his edition, in 1590, of the text adopted previously by the Council of Trent; this edition, in spite of all the decrees of the Pope, and the previous ratification of the Council, was found to be so shamefully incorrect, that Clement VIII., in 1592, suppressed it entirely, to substitute his own.[4] And now we know with what success Kortholt[5] has refuted the pretensions of Bellarmine respecting this latter vulgate; and especially with what overwhelming evidence the learned Thomas James has demonstrated its errors, additions, omissions and contradictions.[6]

[1] See Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum, 1849, prolegomena, p. 83; and 1858, p. 64.

[2] "Jam sexto saeculo," says Tischendorf, "Cassiodori senis cura in eo posita, erat, ut conlatis priscis codicibus textus Hieronymi restitueretur."

[3] Moreover, these were made from manuscripts badly chosen, and much more recent than the *Codex Amiatinus*, now preserved in the library of St Laurence at Florence, dated 541, and reproduced in his Latin version by the care of Tischendorf, (Testam. Triglott., proleg. lxxxi. Leipsic, 1854.) See also Carpzov., Critica Sacra, part ii., cap. vi.

[4] See Rich. Simon, Hist. Crit. des Versions der N. T., chap. xii.

[5] De Variis Script. Editionib., cap. viii.–xiv., (1686.)

[6] In his Bellum Papale sive Concordia Discors., Sexti Quinti et Clementis Octavi Circa Hieronymianam Editionem, &c. Lond., 1678, (1st ed., 1600.)

SECTION FOURTH.

THE SERIOUS DIVISIONS OF THE JEWS.

464. *The Eighth Fact.*—This preservation of the Old Testament, so manifestly Divine—this marvellous and universal agreement of the Jewish people on the canon, as the text of the oracles of God—is rendered still more striking by their serious divisions on every other subject. Observe the hostility of their ancient sects; observe their Pharisees, and the folly of their traditions, which, opposed as they were to the divine declarations, never ventured to exalt themselves against one of these sacred books. Observe the impiety of their Sadducees, who even denied the existence of spirits, and who, though altogether ignorant, and contradicting the Scriptures, (Mark xii. 24; Matt. xxii. 29,) yet never rejected, and never altered them. Observe, again, the boldness of their modern neologists, their unbelief, their adoption of the most repulsive systems of contemporaneous rationalism, and their materialism on the subject even of the destinies of Israel. Observe, especially, the idolatrous fondness of almost all their synagogues and doctors for the Talmud, the teachings of which they exalt even at this day to the level of, and even above, the Scriptures. God has left them to themselves for all their aberrations and all their errors. What do I say? Did He not permit them, at first, "to kill the Prince of Life," and then, for 1800 years, to reject Him whom all their Scriptures announce? Yes; but He never permitted them to change the canon or the text of these very Scriptures, because "the sacred deposit had been intrusted to them."

SECTION FIFTH.

THE EXAMPLE OF JESUS AND HIS APOSTLES IN RELATION TO THE APOCRYPHA.

465. *The Ninth Fact.*—We have cited above the cardinal and authoritative fact—the example of Jesus Christ. Our canon of the Old Testament, such as we have received it from the Jews, as we have said, must have been guaranteed and guarded by God, since Jesus Christ, the Alpha and Omega of all the divine reve-

lations—Jesus Christ, the "God of the holy prophets," (Rev. xxii. 6,)—received it in its entireness, reading it in the synagogue, quoting it in all His teachings, and, even on the cross, expounding it in all its parts, (Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets,)—after His resurrection—in His miraculous appearances, &c.

466. But Jesus Christ, while recognising the canon of the Old Testament as a perfect and sacred collection, never cited *any of the Apocryphal books*[1] as the Word of God; neither did His apostles. And yet these books are equal in extent to at least a sixth part of the Holy Scriptures; while we count as many as 300 passages of the Old Testament quoted in the New.

SECTION SIXTH.

DIVINE INJUNCTIONS.

467. *The Tenth Fact.*—The continual intervention of God for the preservation of His Word is often rendered manifest by the divine injunctions. When Moses had written the book of the law, without anything being deficient, it was needful, in order to impress all hearts with the deepest reverence for it, to deliver it to the priests and to all the elders of Israel, ordering the Levites, who bare the ark, to take the Holy Book and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant, in the Holy of Holies, where the divine Presence was manifested, and into which the high priest entered only once a year.[2] The order, moreover, had been given, that if any one was recognised as a false prophet, or enticed his neighbour to idolatry, death without mercy was to be inflicted, even on a brother, a son, a daughter, a beloved wife, or a most intimate friend. The hands of his nearest relations were to be the first to execute the punishment, and then the hands of all the people.[3] And the order was added, that every seven years this Holy Word

[1] The passages of the New Testament which certain authors have alleged were cited from the Apocrypha were not taken from it; they are in the canonical books. See this question treated by Horne, (Introd., Appendix, p. 464, London, 1846,) and especially in Cosin, who carefully discusses the objected passages, (History of the Canon, ch. iii., art. 34–41.) See also our Appendix on the Apocrypha.

[2] Deut. xxxi. 9, 24–26.

[3] Deut. xiii. 5, xviii. 20; Jer. xiv. 15; Zech. xiii. 3.

was to be recited publicly to all Israel, assembled before Jehovah,[1] and that, at every new reign, the king, as soon as he had mounted the throne, was to copy it with his own hand from the sacred autograph which the priests kept in the sanctuary.[2]

Later still, all the inspired books were deposited in the most Holy Place.[3]

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE DIVINE DISPENSATIONS.

468. *The Eleventh Fact.*—The same intervention is equally manifested by protective dispensations. A long series of them may be seen in the history of this people. The Holy Word was very often in danger of being lost and disappearing;[4] but the power of the Most High never ceased to take means for its preservation.

From Samuel to the days of Ezra, God raised up, especially in the darkest times, what Josephus has termed *the uninterrupted succession of the prophets,*[5] (*τὴν τῶν Προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχήν.*) Keeping watch like sentinels in the house of God, and faithful to the death, these prophets preserved the deposit of the ancient Scriptures, enriched it with new books, and bore their testimony to it, without ever complaining (as we have said) that it had suffered the least alteration. You see them, even during the captivity of seventy years, continuing their admirable ministry;—Jeremiah, in the midst of the poor Jews who were left in Palestine; Ezekiel, among the exiles scattered throughout Assyria; Daniel, among the captives in Babylon; Ezekiel citing at a distance with admiration Daniel his contemporary;[6] Daniel in like manner studying at a distance Jeremiah,[7]—until at last, Ezra, "the scribe of the law of the God of heaven," (Ezra vii. 21,) assisted by the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, finally arranged the sacred collection of the Scriptures, and completed the twenty-two books of the sacred oracles.

[1] Deut. xxxi. 10; Jos. viii. 35.
[2] Deut. xvii. 18; Josh. i. 8; 2 Kings xi. 12; 2 Chron. xxiii. 11.
[3] Josephus, Antiq., iii., 3, § 1; De Bello Jud., vii., 5; 1 Sam. x. 25.
[4] Amos viii. 11; 2 Chron. xv. 3, xvii. 9, xxix. 7, xxxi. 4, 21, xxxiv. 15, &c.
[5] Contra Apion, i., 8; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 10.
[6] Ezek. xxviii. 3, xiv. 14, 20. [7] Dan. ix. 6, 11.

From that time the ancient code was complete, and the pr phetic voice was long silent, to train men's minds to the expect tion of the king Messiah, till at last, "in the sixteenth year of t reign of Tiberius, . . . the word of God came afresh to John, t son of Zecharias, in the wilderness;" and this forerunner of t Most High announced, by the baptism of repentance, "the Lan of God who taketh away the sins of the world," and who wou baptize in the Holy Ghost and in fire.[1]

469. It is the general opinion of the Jews, that no book writt after Malachi was inspired. Josephus[2] affirms it, the Book Maccabees repeats it,[3] and, for this reason, the Jews have nam Malachi, "*the seal of the prophets,*" (חוֹתָם הַנְּבִיאִים,) "becau the succession of these men of God was then broken," Hotting observes,[4]—"*Et quia scriptio θεόπνευστος in prophetarum libr defecit.*" "After Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi," says Jerom "I have seen no other prophet till John the Baptist,—*Nullos ali prophetas usque ad Joannem Baptistam videram.*"

And Augustin, in his *City of God*, (finished two years befo his death,) tells us, in like manner, that "since Malachi, Hagg Ezra, and Zechariah, the Jews had no more prophets till t advent of the Saviour. . . . These prophets were the last to who they attributed a canonical authority,—*Post Malachiam, Ha gæum, et Zechariam, et Esdram, non habuerunt prophetas usq ad salvatores adventum. . . . Hos Judæi in auctoritatem canon cam receptos* novissimos *habent,*" (xvii., the last chapter.)

Section Eighth.

THE CALAMITIES OF THE JEWS.

470. *The Twelfth Fact.*—Another class of facts, which stri ingly demonstrate the same truth, is the use the Divine Omn potence has always made of even the calamities of the Jews f the preservation and dispensation of their Scriptures.

Everything has conduced, in the Lord's hands, to this importa

[1] Luke i. 16, 17, 76, iii., 4, 16.
[2] Contra Apion, i., §
[3] Maccab. ix. 27, xiv. 41.
[4] Thesaurus Philologicus, p. 483. Tiguri, 1639.
[5] In Isa. xlix. 21.

en l—the destruction of their temple, their migrations, their long oppression, the loss of their language, the dispersion of their race.

(1.) The destruction of their temple. This event gave birth to the powerful institution of their numerous synagogues. In each of these buildings was placed a sacred chest, containing the roll of the Scriptures, that at first the law might be read three times in the week, and then, from the time of Antiochus, the prophets every Sabbath-day.[1] The rabbins said "that a synagogue ought to be built wherever ten Jews could be found to meet together." Jerusalem alone, in the days of Jesus Christ, contained 480.[2]

(2.) Their migrations. Their synagogues and their Scriptures accompanied them to all parts of the ancient world,—to Italy, to Spain, to Africa, to Asia, to Persia, to Babylonia, and even to China. "Moses of old time hath in every city," St James affirmed, "them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day," (Acts xv. 25.)

(3.) The loss of their language. This event originated, first, an influential class of *scribes*, and then a vast and important collection of *Targums*. The scribes devoted especially to the study and interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures were numerous, even in the time of Ezra. We see them then stationed round him at the feast of tabernacles, translating into Chaldee for the people the Scriptures which the prophet read in Hebrew, (Neh. vii. 3–8.) And as to the Targums, (Chaldee paraphrases,) they are of great value still, in the present day, to attest the inviolable purity of the ancient Hebrew text, and to assist in its interpretation—*the Targum of Onkelos* on the books of Moses; *the Targum of Jonathan* on the greater and minor prophets; *the Targum of Joseph the blind* on the Hagiographa; and *the Targum of Jerusalem* on the Pentateuch.[3]

(4.) Their long oppression under Alexander's successors. This oppression originated, 280 years before Christ, the celebrated Greek version of the Septuagint, which, made by Jews for the use of Jews, contributed so powerfully to spread and to preserve among all nations the knowledge of the Old Testament.

[1] Lightfoot, (on Matt. iv. 23.)

[2] Prideaux, Connexion, &c., vi.; Buxtorf, Lexicon Rabbinicum, col. 292.

[3] See, on the Targums, Carpzov., Critica Sacra Vet. Testamenti, part. ii., cap. i.

(5.) I have named, lastly, the dispersion of their race. Even this calamity made them feel the need of providing for ever for the perfect preservation of the letter of their Scriptures, and the correct pronunciation of every Hebrew word, by the astonishing performance of the Masora, (מָסוֹרֶת,)—that is to say, a collection of traditions relative to the minutest details of the sacred text; the fixation of the accents and vowel-points; the enumeration of the verses, words, and letters—5245 verses in the Pentateuch, for instance, and 23,206 in the whole Bible; the indication of irregularities found in the position, and form, or size of certain letters; the marginal corrections of the *Keri* and the *Chetib*, &c., &c. It is, therefore, a very proper title the Jews themselves have given to the Masora—"*The Fence of the Law*," since it preserves the Old Testament from all invasion and alteration, not only in its sacred canon, but in its words, letters, and smallest accents.

SECTION NINTH.

THE MIRACLE OF THEIR RACE.

471. *The Thirteenth Fact.*—The miraculous preservation of the Jewish people is not only an image, but a pledge, of the miraculous preservation of their Scriptures.

"The existence of this people, through 1700 years of exile and depression," says Basnage, "is the greatest prodigy that can be imagined. The event is unexampled." See them always wandering and dispersed; always unbelieving, yet guarding the Scriptures; always hated, spoiled, persecuted, massacred, and yet indestructible, and, as it were, infusible, amidst all the other nations on the face of the globe. They alone, over all the earth, offer the unheard-of spectacle of one and the same family, without foreign intermixture, for 3000 years, in the midst of a confused mingling of all the human races. They alone have seen all the empires of their most powerful persecutors perish, one after another, whilst they, without power, without a safe asylum, without country, are still in existence, according to the prophecies of their sacred books, "without a king, without a prince, without a temple, without sacrifice, without an image, without an altar," and, conse-

quently, without the possibility of a worship conformed to their own ritual, (Hosea iii. 4.)

At the strange and incomparable spectacle of this bush of Horeb, kept always burning before the eyes of all nations for 3000 years, but always unconsumed, we say, that if this unexampled prodigy attests that an invisible almighty arm has been constantly extended over this people, we are also authorised to affirm, that the astonishing preservation of the Holy Scriptures, carried to all places by this same people attests a Divine agency of the same order. The Jew carries them for thirty centuries, without losing a single word of them, and without a single copy, (even in our day,) among the most ancient synagogue in Judea or Persia, being found to differ from the copies read in Morocco, or in the synagogues of America. Certainly, this preservation of a collection that was begun three centuries before the Trojan war, that took nine centuries to complete, and that has been continually recopied from that time, in all regions of the earth, during 3000 years, —this signal, incomparable fact, adapted to impress equally the simplest and the loftiest minds—this fact, so evidently miraculous, declares to us, with irresistible force, that God watches over the nation ; over the one, to maintain it unaltered ; as over the other, to preserve it imperishable to the end of time.

Section Tenth.

HUMAN BOOKS INTRUDED INTO THE JEWISH CANON BY ONE OF THE CHRISTIAN SECTS.

472. *The Fourteenth Fact.*—The history of apocryphal books attests, not less powerfully, the same truth, and renders more conspicuous, by what has taken place among Christians, the astonishing fidelity of the Jews in the preservation of their Scriptures.

How much more credible would it appear that, through ignorance, or carelessness, to which exile, misfortune, and dispersion had reduced them, the Israelites would be more tempted than the Christians to introduce into their sacred collection those apocryphal writings which treat of their own history, and tend, almost all of them, to flatter their national pride.

To appreciate the full force of this fourteenth fact, it must be

viewed, at the same time, in its relation to Christians and to Jews, though, in some respects, we may anticipate what we have to say in a subsequent chapter, when we treat of the New Testament.

If, on the one hand, the Jews, *to whom were intrusted the oracles of God*, could crucify the Lord of Glory, and for 1800 years reject the New Testament, which was never intrusted to them, yet this people were not disposed, or, at least, they never were able, and never will be, to introduce any apocryphal book into the Old Testament, because the deposit was intrusted to them; and God, under this form, became the guarantee.

And, on the other hand, if we have seen among Christians in the sixteenth century a numerous and powerful sect assume the power to introduce as the Word of God eleven human books into the canon of the Old Testament, it is only because the deposit had not been intrusted to them. It was intrusted to the Jews, not to us; we receive it from their hands.

473. The twofold fact and the twofold contrast we have just pointed out claim the most attentive consideration. While the Church of Rome has put forth such pretensions with respect to the Old Testament, neither this sect, powerful as it is, nor any of the other Christian sects, has been able *to add a single apocryphal book to the New Testament;* God has not permitted it, and will not permit it. He will not permit it, because all Christian churches, good or bad, faithful or unfaithful, have been intrusted with this sacred deposit, and because all must preserve it inviolate, as the Jews have preserved the Old, God having constituted Himself the guarantee of their fidelity.

Let, then, the disciples of Jesus Christ contemplate with reverence these two depositaries of our sacred books, and see with what power this twofold testimony of their contrast and their resemblance presents itself before their eyes. Behold them equally indocile, equally refractory as to the deposit that was not intrusted to them; but behold both the one and the other alike continuing always docile and always faithful as to the deposit with which they are concerned; the one, for 2300 years since the completion of the Old Testament; the other, for 1400 years since the entire canon of the New Testament has been definitely received by all the churches of Christendom.

474. Let it then be clearly understood, that neither ignorance nor error, nor the profane rashness of this or that church throughout Christendom on the subject of the Old Testament, will be capable of at all affecting the inviolability of a canon which was never intrusted to them.

If I have deposited my last will under strictly legal forms, with a notary duly chosen, will my heirs after my decease have the least doubt in the world of the integrity or validity of this document, because one of them might contrive to introduce, after many years, some remarkable additions into the authentic copy he has received of it, and because he presumes to take no account of the original text, or of the attestation, or of the depositary, or of the laws? They will not feel the slightest concern. What does it signify to them? This folly and culpable fancy cannot in the least affect the paternal testament.

Thus, then, the outrage committed by the Council of Trent in 1546, so far from weakening the marvellous fact of the inviolability of the Old Testament, serves only to render it more conspicuous. For, as we have said, even the unfaithfulness of the Christians and that of the Jews with respect to that of the two deposits with which they were not intrusted, makes their unshaken fidelity in respect of the other more impressive, and powerfully demonstrates to us the intervention of God in this double testimony.

Section Eleventh.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.

475. *A Fifteenth Fact* which illustrates still more the admirable fidelity of Israel in reference to the canon, and powerfully confirms the interpretation which the Christian Church in every age has given, like ourselves, to Paul's doctrine on the part providentially assigned to this people for the preservation of the Old Testament, is the constant testimony of the whole Eastern Church.

We speak here not only of its loud protest against the new dogma of the Church of Rome on the subject of the apocryphal books, but especially of the sacred reason which it alleges, with ourselves, to condemn it. You have ignored, she says, the scrip-

tural doctrine relative to the canon; you have forgotten that "the oracles of God have been intrusted to the Jews."

We must here adduce the evidence on behalf of this testimony, because the doctors of the Church of Rome, being aware how forcibly it tells against them, have often endeavoured to mislead us on this important fact.

The Orthodox Catholic Oriental Church, as she likes to call herself—this Church, more ancient than that of Rome—"has never received the apocryphal books into the canon of the inspired books," notwithstanding the estimation in which she otherwise holds many of these books, as worthy of being read, and notwithstanding the temptation presented to her more than to other churches from the use she has always made of the Greek version of the LXX.

In evidence of this important fact, it will be sufficient to cite here (1.) "*The Orthodox Doctrine*,"[1] by Plato, (Archbishop of Moscow,) published at Athens in 1836; and (2.) "*The Great Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church*," approved by the holy supreme synod, and "published at Moscow in 1839 by order of his imperial majesty for the use of schools and all orthodox Christians." This latter work, sent to all the patriarchs, Blackmore says, (preface, pp. 6, 9,) is held throughout the East to be of higher authority even than the *Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem*, or than the *Orthodox Confession*. It was drawn up by Philaret, the last metropolitan of Moscow, the immediate successor of Plato.

476. In his *Orthodox Doctrine*, the illustrious archbishop, after giving the names of the twenty-two books of the Old Testament just as they have been transmitted to us by the Jewish canon, (from Genesis to Malachi,) adds, "And as to all those that are not included in this number, they contain many passages morally deserving of praise, *but they have never been received by the Church as canonical.* ("Οσα δὲ εἶναι ἔξω ἀπὸ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦτον, ἀγκαλὰ περιέχουσι πολλὰ ἠθικὰ ἀξιέπαινα δὲν[2] ἐδέχθησαν ὅμως ποτὲ ὡς κανονικὰ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.)"[3]

[1] Ὀρθόδοξος Διδασκαλία, (in modern Greek,) at Athens, 1836, p. 59.

[2] Need we say that δὲν, derived from οὐδέν, is the negative in modern Greek.

[3] It is added in Greek—See Gregory the theologian, in his verses (στιχοι)

477. As to the *Great Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church*, the following are its lessons on the canon:—

"*Quest.* How many books are there in the Old Testament?

"*Ans.* St Cyril of Jerusalem, St Athanasius the Great, and St John of Damascus reckoned twenty-two, in conformity with the Jews, who number them thus in the original Hebrew.

"*Quest.* Why must we conform to the recension of the Jews?

"*Ans.* Because, as the apostle Paul has said, *to them were the oracles of God intrusted*, and the sacred books of the old covenant have been received from the Hebrew Church of that covenant by the Christian Church of the new, (Rom. iii. 2.)

"*Quest.* How do St Cyril and St Athanasius enumerate the books of the Old Testament?

"*Ans.* As follows:—(1.) Genesis; (2.) Exodus, (3.) Leviticus; (4.) Numbers; (5.) Deuteronomy; (6.) Joshua; (7.) Judges, with Ruth; (8.) 1st and 2d Kings; (9.) 3d and 4th Kings; (10.) Paralepomena; (11.) Ezra and Nehemiah; (12.) Esther; (13.) Job; (14.) Psalms; (15.) Proverbs; (16.) Ecclesiastes; (17.) Song of Songs; (18.) Isaiah; (19.) Jeremiah; (20.) Ezekiel; (21.) Daniel; (22.) The Twelve Minor Prophets.

"*Quest.* Why do they not reckon the *Book of Wisdom of the Son of Sirach*, and some others?

"*Ans. Because they are not in the Hebrew.*

"*Quest.* How must they be considered?

"*Ans.* Athanasius the Great said that the ancient fathers caused them to be read to the proselytes who were preparing to enter the Church."

478. We may further consult, on this point, the *Comparative View of the Nineteen Doctrines that Separate the Eastern and Western Churches*, composed in 1815 by the last metropolitan of Moscow, and transmitted to Dr Pinkerton[1] in 1832, with permission to publish it. The following is the tenth article:—

"The Holy Scriptures, which serve as the rule of our faith, are contained in the thirty-nine canonical books of the Old Testa-

on the books of the Old and New Testament; and Metrophanes, in the confession of the Eastern Church, ($\mu\epsilon\phi$. ζ.)

[1] Pinkerton's Russia, London, 1833, p. 39.

ment,[1] and in the twenty-seven of the New. But the third and fourth of Ezra, Tobit, Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, Baruch, the first, second, and third of Maccabees, as well as various additions made to certain books of the Old Testament;—all these writings, though esteemed by the Church for their antiquity and the sound doctrine they contain, are regarded by her as *apocryphal;* that is, as books of which the divine *origin is hidden from our faith,* or is an *object of doubt,* because neither *the Church of the Old Testament nor the Christian Church has ever acknowledged them as canonical.*"

479. *The Sixteenth Fact.*—We shall presently shew that this was in like manner the constant testimony of the whole Western Church till the Council of Trent, and that an appeal was always made to the doctrine of Paul, and to the divine commission given to the Jewish people, as had been done by Jerome, Tertullian, and Pope Gregory.

Section Twelfth.

This resistance of the Eastern Church is rendered more striking by the universality of the use of the Septuagint.

480. *The Seventeenth Fact.*—When we consider that the Greek version of the LXX. was either by itself, or by the Latin version made from it, of universal use in the ancient Church to the days of Jerome; while all the copies of it were more or less surcharged with *apocryphal* books by the Christians of Egypt, and that they had unwisely adopted the custom of binding them with the Scriptures, though never attributing to them the same authority,—we ought to be filled with admiration at that providence which watches over the oracles of God, that, in spite of all these temptations, the Jewish synagogues never admitted them, however flattering these human books might be to their national pride. And we shall presently see, that even the Christian churches, both in the East and West, were a long time kept from adopting these false scriptures as canonical.

[1] This is the manner in which our own Bibles reckon the twenty-two books of the Jews.

SECTION THIRTEENTH.

INFERENCE TO BE DRAWN FROM THESE SEVENTEEN FACTS.

481. We are able, then, to infer once more, from this fourth class of proofs, the divine inviolability of the sacred canon of the Old Testament.

For we have been establishing, by an assemblage of facts, almost all marvellous, powerful, and extending through ages, that if the people of the Jews, sovereignly appointed, in spite of their calamities and their vices, to be the constant depositary of the oracles of God, and to transmit them for ever to the world in their integrity —if this miraculous people, to the present time, and for thirty-three centuries, have been perfectly faithful to the Divine mandate, and that, during the very time of its longest dispersions, and most criminal rebellions, from the days of Pharaoh and Semiramis, to those of Napoleon III. and Victoria—this incomparable phenomenon, which has never ceased to emit its splendour before all nations, and across all the ages of their history,—this phenomenon, not more than any of the seventeen great facts which accompany it, not being explicable from mere natural causes, will always clearly demonstrate to us the secret and constant interven- of the Divine power.

Thus, then, in relation to the Old Testament, we are obliged, at the end of this fourth chapter, to infer seventeen times, from all these facts, and their marvellous combination, what, in our preceding chapters, we had already inferred four times,—from the character of God,—from His works in the Church,—from the infallible testimony of Jesus Christ, and His apostles,—and from the positive statement in the Epistle to the Romans; namely, the certainty of that doctrine which the apostle Paul announced, and which we have named, "the doctrine of the canon."

This doctrine, which is its own guarantee, is that which has constituted the Jewish people the incorruptible record-keeper (as Augustin calls them)[1] of their sacred oracles—which has never ceased to watch over this deposit from age to age, and now main-

[1] Capsarii nostri, (on Ps. xl.;) Librarii nostri, (on Ps. lvi.;) Scriniaria nostra, (Contra Faust., xii., 13.)

tains it ever intact and complete; so that this preservation is not less miraculous than that of the race itself of the Jews, distinct from all nations for 3780 years, infusible, and indestructible, in every region under heaven.

In a word, we infer that this inviolability of the canon of Scripture must be regarded, as well as the Divine inspiration of their text, as one of the doctrines of our faith.

482. Go, then, with confidence, bearing in your hands Moses and the prophets, ye ministers of our churches, ye pastors of our cultivated cities, and ye humble evangelists of our villages, and ye, also, who traverse our Alps, like Felix Neff, from one *châlet* to another, and ye holy missionaries of Africa or Asia, address with confidence your most learned equally with your least educated hearers; go with this Book of God, without fearing lest they should ask the history of its canon, and without being disquieted about what it is not in your power to tell them, since it does not exist. You know as much respecting it as Daniel the prophet, or as Paul the apostle of the Gentiles. You know even more than they, since you possess eighteen or twenty-three centuries more of experience, during which God has incessantly preserved, by means of the Jews, His oracles pure from all adulteration. Go, then, boldly, as the prophet went to the synagogues of Babylon,—as the apostle went to those of Lycaonia; for you have the same things to tell them to establish the integrity of the sacred volume—and all that they could say, you can say. Go, then, ye ministers of the gospel—go, full of confidence, preach Jesus Christ everywhere, by the books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets. Go, preach His pre-existence, His Divinity, His cross, His expiatory sacrifice, His resurrection, His grace, His presence with His people, His return, and His glory. The whole Gospel is found in them. Let these mighty Scriptures be ever in your hands. By them the man of God is rendered "wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus."[1] If the New Testament sheds immense light upon the Old, the Old Testament, in its turn, illuminates the New to its most secret depths. "He is not a man of full age," says St Paul, "but a babe, in the

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 15.

first principles of the oracles of God, and still to be nourished with milk, who is not well versed in Moses and the prophets."

I pass now to the New Testament.

483. Yet, before coming to it, it appears necessary for us to set apart thirty-six propositions to the question of the apocryphal books, because they will be needed, we think, as an indispensable lemma for the last part of our argument. We have made a separate chapter of them on account of the extent and importance of the subject. It is true, it may be objected, that this topic, to which we recur, does not necessarily belong to the object before us; since we are here discussing the Old Testament, which was intrusted to the Jews, and not to Christians. What has it to do with the question, it may be said, if, 2000 years after the last prophet had ceased to write,[1] one religious sect was to be found in the West that attempted to add eleven books to their Scriptures?

We answer that, in fact, this has nothing to do with it directly. But this matter occupies so great a place in the controversy of the churches, that we believe the digression is more calculated to clear the ground than to encumber it. Yet, on further reflection, it seems best to place this chapter in an Appendix at the end of the volume, and only to make a reference to it here.

[1] From Malachi, 420 years before Christ, to the Council of Trent, in 1546.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE APOCRYPHA.

We shall place the thirty-six propositions relating to it at the
of this volume; because we must hasten to finish here our p
of the inviolable preservation of the entire canon, presenting
this purpose, in relation to the New Testament, a new class
facts, striking, manifestly providential, and extending thr
ages, which attest, with a force that seems to us not less
sistible, that God has never ceased to stretch over them His
visible, but almighty arm.

CHAPTER VI

FIFTH CLASS OF PROOFS.—A NEW ASSEMBLAGE OF FACTS RELATING TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

520. It will be seen that we can as confidently invoke the testimony of history for this second portion of the Scriptures as for the first; for the new assemblage of facts will demonstrate to us what other facts of the same kind have already so manifestly established for the Old Testament—namely, that the faithfulness of God, always wakeful, protects the Scriptures that were first given to His Church; and that if, to accomplish this work for His first oracles, it chose the Jewish people, thirty-four centuries ago, it has set apart, for a similar purpose, for His last oracles, the collective body of all the churches, good or bad, throughout Christendom.

Section First.

THE UNANIMITY OF ALL THE CHURCHES.

521. *The First Fact.*—Among the astonishing and enduring facts which reveal this supreme hand, there is one which surpasses all others. We refer to the marvellous, universal, unshaken unanimity with which all the churches in the world have continued, for fourteen or fifteen centuries, to present us with one and the same collection of twenty-seven books, one and the same Greek Testament—its four Gospels, its one-and-twenty epistles, its Apocalypse, and Book of the Acts, without the difference of a single word, since none of the churches have formed a separate school on the question, otherwise so little important, of the various readings.

No doubt, in every age, and in our own times more than ever, learned men are to be seen taking the greatest liberties with our sacred books, bringing in question their authority, imagining a thousand systems about their history, doubting of one, rejecting another, and even denying the divine inspiration of the canon altogether. But, at all times, these have been isolated persons, and instances of individual temerity.

Never, since the epoch when the canon was definitely closed and formed in all the churches, for more than fourteen centuries, by the free action of men's minds, and under the invisible government of Divine Providence—never has any general council, any synod, any particular church, Arian or Trinitarian, Romanist or Reformed, Free or National, been seen to profess, in its decrees or its catechisms, that it rejected any of the books of the New Testament, or even to express publicly its doubts respecting any of them. And this in the age of Alaric, as in the times of the Reformation, or in modern days; in Europe, as in the East, or as in the United States; at Rome, as in that Germany, where, from day to day, so many audacious systems are fabricated, and where the infidelity of the schools has so sadly prevailed.

522. Such, then, under the agency of Providence, is the admirable, and, I venture to call it, the divine unanimity of Christendom on the twenty-seven books of its sacred code. This unanimity is continuous, œcumenical, unalterable, and not less persistent than that of the Jews for their own canon. It is even a unanimity still more astonishing, since the prodigy we admire in that family of Israel, which has always guarded its sacred oracles, for thirty-four centuries—this same prodigy we have to admire here in all the families of nations, who have equally guarded their New Testament, in the midst of their most ardent controversies, and widest divisions; they guard it in the rudest churches, in spite of their ignorance; in the most idolatrous, in spite of their traditions; as well as in those who lay the greatest claims to science, spite of their sceptical literature, and all the aberrations of their men of learning. Finally, this unanimity is more striking, because it is found among them only on this point; while, on every other, they set themselves in ardent opposition, church against church.

Seek for any other dogma on which they have been agreed for fourteen centuries, on which they are agreed in the present day, you will not find it. Seek, again, on the other hand, for any point more important, and more fundamental—any point, at the same time, more delicate, and more likely to excite discussions than this,—you will not find it. And yet it has never been possible for the levity of the human mind, for the temerity of learning, for the excesses of party spirit, for all the malice of Satan, to set them at variance on this single dogma—a dogma the most important of all, we say, and the most delicate, the most fundamental, and the most likely to excite discussion!

Search the whole earth—search from age to age, for a church where this disagreement, so easy, so probable, has made its appearance,—you will not find it.

523. So evident it is that a secret but almighty hand has interposed, and that the Head of the Church watches in silence over His new oracles, as He watched over the old,—preserving them, from age to age, from human foolishness, because He has promised to preserve the Church itself for ever from "the gates of hell."

In this work it has pleased God constantly not to discover His holy arm, leaving the churches, under His secret influence, to act with a constant feeling of their free-will and independence; and this not only without any sensible pressure of His hand being felt by them, but also without any intervention of human authority to constrain their will, as we shall soon shew. And thus He has led, by His Spirit, their common liberty to this marvellous result, in order that, from a multitude of human wills, we should receive, during so many ages, only one and the same scripture of the New Testament.

524. But if we cannot help studying and admiring this prodigy of the Divine wisdom, which watches over the sacred deposit, need we be astonished—we who have seen it at work during thirty-three centuries to maintain the people of Israel infusible and indestructible in the midst of the nations—and who have seen it, during these same centuries, maintain, in the midst of this same people, an inflexible will in relation to the Old Testament,—need we be astonished if the same hand, always invisible, and

always powerful, has also succeeded in making all the Christia churches in the world, in spite of their dissensions and bacl slidings, the incorruptible depositaries of His new oracles?

525. No one will think of opposing to this universal testimor of the churches the Ethiopian manuscripts discovered by tl missionary Gobat in the unexplored districts of Abyssinia, n the Syriac manuscripts shewn to Dr Grant, in the high mountai of Koordistan, by those interesting Nestorians whom he discover there, and who, for so many ages, have lived apart from the re of the Christian world. "The Apocalypse, and two or three the shorter epistles," he says, but without naming them, were st wanting to these isolated Christians, who had not rejected the but were ignorant of them until they were eager to range then selves, with the other Syrian churches, on the side of the univers canon.

526. Let us, then, give the utmost attention to this great fac so manifestly providential—this striking testimony offered to tl world for so many ages.

ALL THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD HAV ONLY ONE SACRED TEXT—the Greek New Testament, with i twenty-seven books—such as would be presented to you alike b the priests at Moscow, by the ministers at Geneva, by the Prop ganda at Rome, or by the Bible Society in London. "*To the have been intrusted the oracles of God.*"

In whatever age or country I might be living, since the da when the canon was completely formed solely by the action men's consciences in the Church,[1] everywhere and always tl same Scriptures would be presented to me; in the times of The dosius, as in that of Bonaparte; among Papists, as among Pr testants; among the Eastern churches, as among those of tl West during the thousand years of their reciprocal schism. might have asked for it, 1400 years ago, of the Nestorians Asia, as of the Council of Ephesus, by whose orders their boo were destroyed. I might have addressed myself, three centuri later, to 350 Greek bishops, who declared at the Council of Ni that the worship of images was "holy, just, and useful," or to 30 Latin bishops who, seven years after, condemned it at Frankfort

[1] See Propp. 52-54, 312, 527-530.

to the Albigenses of the thirteenth century, who were burnt for wishing to read it, as well as to the inquisitors, bent on destroying them by fire and sword; to the Bohemians of the fifteenth century, as well as to the fathers of the Council of Constance, who put them to death; to the Reformers of the sixteenth century, as well as to the bishops of France who exterminated them. And this very year, if I wished to procure a Greek New Testament, pure and complete, I might ask indifferently for the edition of the Catholic Scholz, or that of the Protestant Tischendorf,—everywhere its twenty-seven books complete!—everywhere this book guarded by God as it had been given by Him—everywhere the churches conducted infallibly but freely to unity by an invisible power—everywhere their unconscious obedience leading them to preserve the sacred collection of books, as it had led them at first to receive it,—everywhere God giving testimony to the world that, "having spoken to the fathers by the prophets, and then to their children, by His own Son, by whom also He made the worlds, He has never ceased, and never will cease, to watch over His Divine Word; He will preserve the deposit from age to age, until He comes to judge the living and the dead by the same Word."

In explaining at some length this first fact, which takes the lead of all the rest, and proclaims to us so loudly the divine certainty of the canon, we could not help making some allusions, by anticipation, to other circumstances, not less providential, which accompanied it. These we must now bring forward and explain in their turn.

SECTION SECOND.

THE EXCEPTIONAL LIBERTY WHICH ALWAYS PRESIDED OVER THE DESTINIES OF THE CANON.

527. *The Second Fact.*—Another characteristic not less providential, since, contrary to all probability, it has never ceased to reappear from the apostolic times to the blessed Reformation, and down to our own day—the altogether exceptional rule of liberty under which all the destinies of the canon have been accomplished in the Christian Church. At first its original formation, then its completion, then at last its perfect and continual preservation.

528. Whence, but from God, could come that surprising and

entire absence of all pressure from without, while this threefo process was silently going on in the Church, and leading ever where without dispute to the same result? How can it be e plained, without this agency from above, that every act of auth rity, every synodal decree, and every intervention of the powe of the state, has been continually suspended, in reference to t most important and yet the most delicate of questions?

We have already noticed this extraordinary fact; but it is unique of its kind in the history of the churches, that it has claim on our most serious attention, inasmuch as it attests wi irresistible force the constant agency of the divine Power in t formation, the completion, and the preservation of our sacr canon.

We see here the same Spirit who at first caused our sacr books to be written as they are, and who afterwards superintend all those second causes which were destined to make their dep sitaries receive them and then guard them during 1500 years.

For how, without the agency of this Spirit, can you explai that, through so many ages, and in all the Churches of Christendo such freedom had been left to consciences on the very question i relation to which we could expect the least—on the dogma fro which all others would proceed—on the fixation of the eter code—on the judge of controversies—on the dogma of dogmas How was there so much liberty in relation to this one point whe in relation to all others, there was so little?—when decrees we multiplied on objects of the least importance—when all t churches of the East and West, jealous (often beyond measur for purity of doctrine, exacted from one another public profession explanations, adhesions, or retractations in regard to all oth parts of their creed—when they hurled anathemas against t least errors, and when, in the second century, Victor, bishop Rome, in the pure days of Irenæus, was seen to excommunicat the whole Eastern Church for the single fact of keeping Easter o the fourteenth day of March instead of the following Sunday Were not councils everywhere held against the heretics of t day?—eighty in the fifth century against the Pelagians, Nestorian Eutychians, and Acephali; eighty-six in the fourth against t Arians, Donatists, and Collyredians; eighteen in the third agains

the Novatianists, Origenists, Sabellians, and Manicheans,—to say nothing of those in the second in Asia, in Rome, in Pontus, and in Gaul?

It is, then, an astonishing fact, and manifestly providential, that on this point we can find nowhere in the records of history any public constraint, any collective action of bishops, any decree of councils, any prescription of emperors, although, from the fourth century, they mixed themselves with everything in the Church of God. In one word, we cannot find any act of human authority which intervened to impose on the churches the acceptance of any sacred code, or to force any individual conscience to receive into the canon a single one of the twenty-seven books of which at the present day the New Testament is composed.

Examine, and you will see with a constantly-increasing admiration that, if this affair has been left, alone among all others, to individual inquiry and the regular development of the life of the Church, it was in order that we might all recognise in the invariable and wonderful result of this unshackled exercise of men's consciences through so many ages, the inscrutable guidance of the Holy Spirit.

529. It is thus that the sacred deposit of the Scriptures has been formed without noise, pure, harmonious, and complete, as may be seen in chemistry, when, from a confused mixture, a regular, transparent, and perfect crystal is deposited at the bottom of an undisturbed vessel, in exact accordance with the principles of the science. How comes it to pass that every atom, in silent obedience, not only to the common law of gravitation, but certain inexplicable attractions, should take its proper place with mathematical precision in this brilliant and mysterious unity? The philosopher will point you to the laws of nature, and to the omnipotent Creator who maintains them from age to age. Well! it is thus that the Christian from whom you ask how this lasting deposit of the sacred books has been made in the Universal Church, and how it has been completed, will point you to the privileges of the Church, and to the mighty Redeemer who watches over these revelations to the end of time. He will call upon you to notice with admiration that the examination of the primitive Christians with respect to the second canon lasted nearly three

centuries—that it was always carried on, contrary to all expec tion, under the exceptional and mysterious rule of mutual supp —that, during all this time, every Christian teacher, perfec independent, could freely publish his doubts. Nor were churches ever known to criminate one another on this questi and when at last the crystallisation was completed, the marvell invariableness never ceased for fifteen centuries more, all congregations of Christendom exhibiting a miraculous agreem on this single point.

The crystal, once formed, remains unaltered, and thus t assemblage of facts, in the midst of liberty so constant, impre on our sacred collection the dignified and unquestionable charac of a divine sanction.

530. When the whole of Christendom, convoked by the vo of the Roman emperors, assembled at Nice in 325, and at C stantinople in 381, the four Gospels were placed on a throne gold in the midst of the assembly, to indicate the supre authority of the Sacred Word. The first canon of the *homo goumena* was then acknowledged by all the fathers by a t agreement; but opinions still varied freely among them on subject of the second canon and on the second-first. No raised his voice to complain of this, and the important quest was reserved. We have shewn above that it was settled alm universally from the date of this council by the free assent men's consciences, without any decree relating to it having b even proposed in this assembly. And afterwards, towards end of the century, you might hear the Council of Laodicea 364) and of Carthage (in 397) prepare in different ways catalogue of books which *might be publicly read* in Christ assemblies; you would discover that this was on their part sim an arrangement of discipline, since their only object was, as t said, to regulate in this way the offices of worship, and not determine dogmatically the number of the inspired Scriptu It is a proof of this (as we have said elsewhere) that not o these two catalogues were not identical, and that no one co plained of their not being so, at Carthage, but that, long af these two councils, the church teachers continued to exer the most perfect liberty of judgment on this matter, without

of them feeling himself bound by these decrees, or ever having appealed in their writings to these two assemblies, either to attack or to defend any one of the controverted books.

Unquestionably, in this fact, doubly strange, of a liberty of fifteen centuries, combined with an agreement always unchangeable among all the Churches, even those most opposed to one another in Christendom, every one must recognise a manifest attestation of the Providence that watches secretly over the canon. In order that no one might fail to perceive it, it has caused all the depositaries of the Word to arrive at unity, and to maintain it from generation to generation, without its being possible to perceive in this astonishing harmony the trace of any fallible authority—the pressure of any human hand.

We infer, then, once more, that the God of the holy prophets has taken care that His new oracles of the New Testament should be intrusted as securely to the new people of God as those of the Old Testament were to the Jews.

Section Third.

THE PROGRESS OF MINDS IN A WAY REVERSE OF THEIR NATURAL DIRECTION.

531. *Third Fact.*—We have here a general and permanent fact, which cannot be explained by the sole action of natural causes, and which marks the wonderful agreement to which Providence has led, as to the second canon, all the Churches in the world. I refer to the striking contrast which the progress of minds offers on this point to what it has always been on other subjects. In this affair you see them going, for eighteen centuries, in a direction the reverse of what they have always followed when left uncontrolled. In all other questions of doctrine, discipline, and government, have you not always seen them begin with unity, to end, if compulsion has not been used, with divergencies constantly more marked, and with divisions springing up without end? But here, as to the second canon, the most delicate and complicated subject of any, with respect to which they were always left to the most entire liberty, what do you see? You see them begin with divergence, to end in unity; and yet no one can tell

you by what mysterious mental process this has been accomplished! We have shewn before how the primitive churches had received, by the nature of things, notions and impressions relative to the five short later epistles, and how a reciprocal support left them free on this point for several centuries. But what was the issue? All the churches during this process, controlled and inclined without being aware of it by an invisible Power, arrived everywhere, after little more than two centuries of expectation and research, at a marvellous unanimity; and having had occasion, at the council of Nice, to compare their experiences more closely, they perceived that they had all arrived at agreement on this point. By a slow, calm, silent conveyance, becoming more settled every day, they had reached that œcumenical, immovable, and humanly inexplicable unanimity, in which we see them all at the present day!

SECTION FOURTH.

DURING THE TWO CENTURIES AND A HALF IN WHICH THE ANCIENT CHURCH STILL HESITATED RESPECTING THE ANTILEGOMENA SHE NEVER RECEIVED A SPURIOUS BOOK INTO THE CANON.

532. This is *a fourth fact*, well fitted to shew the powerful Providence that presided at the first formation of our canon, as it watched over its destinies from that time.

In the two first centuries and a half of its existence, the ancient Church, already in full possession of its first canon, but more or less hesitating in different places respecting the second, held in her hands, to examine their titles, not only the five small later epistles, but also all the other books, whether authentic, or forged, or apocryphal, which were offered for her examination. It is, then, very remarkable that, during so long a time, she never admitted into the canon any book of which, afterwards, she had to acknowledge the spuriousness. It entered into God's design that she should examine for a long time, and with constant liberty, but never that she should be deceived in her choice. She hesitated, more or less, in some of her congregations respecting the five books of the second canon. Even after a first and long admission of the second-first canon, she listened for a time to

doubts raised in different places respecting the two canonical books of which it is composed; but never, we repeat, has it ever happened to her to admit into the canon any book about which she had afterwards to acknowledge herself mistaken.

This is an invaluable fact, which we have already had occasion to notice;[1] and we recommend it to the attention of the reader.

Section Fifth.

THE ASTONISHING INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH IN REFERENCE TO ITS LITERARY OPPONENTS (*L'ÉCOLE*) ON THE SUBJECT OF THE CANON.

533. *Fifth Fact.*—A fifth characteristic, indicating the agency of God in this affair, is the astonishing independence which the Church has, in every age, shewn of its literary opponents, (*l'école;*) and the constant powerlessness of the latter against our Scriptures, however eloquent, however learned, however numerous their adherents, however bold their negations, and however violent their attacks.

554. Look at the Judaisers and Ebionites in the first century.

[1] Propp. 393–397. If, in the Sixth Chapter of the First Part, we have spoken at length about the Apocrypha of the New Testament, our readers must not be surprised that we have said nothing of the *Sibylline oracles.* They did not seem to us to be of sufficient importance to occupy our attention. Yet it is not uncommon to find in the fathers, especially in Lactantius, mention made of these apocrypha, written in Greek verses. What remains we have of them have been published by Gallaeus, (1689,) by Cardinal Mai, (1817,) and by C. Alexandre, (1841.)

According to the investigations of Dr Bleek and Dr F. Lücke, (*Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis*, Bonn., 1832, §§ 10, 14,) the most ancient parts of the collection date from the second century before Christ; the most recent, from the fifth of our era. The ruin and succession of empires form their habitual theme. Some pieces begin with the fictions of the Greek mythology, and end about the epoch of the Ptolemies, by their palpable allusions to the reign of those princes. A pagan of Alexandria might be the first author of a forgery, which Jewish and Christian interpolators did not hesitate to turn to account. In spite of the gross incoherence of such a medley, they hoped to be able to gain over unbelievers. But Augustin said, very properly, there is a much surer method of convincing pagans, and attracting them to us, for "they will always think that these writings were invented by Christians, (*a Christianis esse conficta;*) for this reason nothing is more efficacious than to quote the predictions concerning Christ contained in the sacred books of the Jews," (*Ideo nihil est firmius ad convincendos quoslibet alienos . . . . nostrosque faciendos . . . . quam ut divina praedicta de Christo ea proferantur, quae in Judaeorum scripta sunt codicibus.*)

In vain did their doctors set themselves in such numbers against all the epistles of Paul; in vain they equally rejected the two books of Luke; amidst the noise of this fierce opposition, the first canon of the New Testament, composed of twenty books, or rather, we may say, the sacred collection of the twenty-two *homologoumena*, might be seen forming itself peaceably, and with the most admirable firmness, in all the churches throughout the world, and forming itself for ever.

535. Observe also, in the second century, the great noise made round the Church by the schools of the Gnostics and all their sects. Far more formidable than the Ebionites, and far more audacious, they attempted to combat our canon in the name of science and philosophy; they opened schools in the most distant parts of the empire, and especially in its capital, under the Antonines, under Commodus, and under Septimius and Alexander Severus, who allowed them all the most entire liberty. They drew around them a number of ardent youths, full of enthusiasm for their eloquence and boldness. They formed schools, especially at Alexandria and Rome, the two centres of philosophy;—Basilides, Isidore, and Carpocrates, in Alexandria; Cerdo, Marcion, Valentine, and Theodotus, in Rome. They harassed alike the churches in the East and in the West, reverencing none of the books of the canon, rejecting here one and there another, wresting their meaning, corrupting their text, and associating them with spurious writings. But what came to pass after all? Nothing was done; but the God of the Scriptures put forth His gracious and powerful hand. He did not constrain human wills; He did not even close by human violence the mouths of the false teachers. For the greater final honour of His Word, He allowed them free course; He only deprived them of reputation. And while the faithful men of the second and third century entered a powerful protest against them—while an Irenæus, a Clement, a Tertullian, an Origen, and a Hippolytus—exposed by learned writings these heresies to the vigilance of their flocks, the heresiarchs mutually discredited themselves, and their denials of the truth in different directions neutralised one another, so that, in spite of the commotion they raised, these schools, after all, exerted but little direct influence on the Churches of God. They unhappily led

astray, no doubt, a great number of young men into the paths of unbelief and death; but they did not hinder the work of the Holy Spirit within the pale of the churches; and if they agitated the surface, they allowed the Sacred Word to produce its effects in the depths below, and the judgment of the Church on the canon was formed and settled in peace.

536. Thus, in spite of all that great tumult of the second and third century, not only was the truth of the first canon settled, better than ever, and settled for ever; but the universal acceptance of the five small later epistles, and the perfect disengagement of the genuine from the spurious books, were seen to be preparing slowly, and without noise, in all the churches of God. This acceptance and this disengagement were consummated in the first quarter of the fourth century,[1] as we see in metallurgy the wonderful separation of silver and gold effected from an alloy of the baser metals.

537. But look again, a thousand years further, at what passed in Europe during the agitated age of the *Renaissance*. At that time, the friends of literature and truth, led to a legitimate scepticism by so many recent discoveries, which had revealed to them imposture or error on all sides, in so many traditions hitherto held sacred, so many forged books, forged legends, forged decretals, and forged texts,—at that time, the friends of truth believed themselves required to call in question the claims of certain books to keep their place in the New Testament. Had they not been already obliged, by the authority of God, to eject the apocryphal books from the temple of the Old Testament? Was it not, then, very natural to fear that, with good intentions, the theologians of the time, still imperfectly informed, would believe themselves required to recommence the examination of our sacred books, and of applying the touchstone even to the gold of the canon? Unquestionably, the moment was one full of peril. Sacred criticism might easily err, and the cause of the canon might seem once more to be seriously compromised. But what came to pass? On the contrary, it came forth more firmly established than ever from this new mental commotion, and, in spite of the labours of a criticism sometimes indiscreet, not a

[1] See Prop. 54, Book I., Chap. VIII., Sect. 2.

single church could be found which was then disposed to re any book of the New Testament, or to admit a new one into it

538. But what are all these trials, to which the ancient scl of criticism has subjected our Scriptures during the first, sec third, fifteenth, or sixteenth centuries, compared to those reser for them by the learned doctors of modern theology? We sp of the most illustrious universities in Protestant Europe, especially in learned and indefatigable Germany, during the la half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth cent One might suppose Cerdo, Marcion, and Basilides risen from t graves. The revolt of criticism, for a time, seemed universal; it might have been apprehended that, before the new invest tions of science, the greater part of the books in our canon n vanish. The youth of the schools were fascinated; professors least negative shrugged their shoulders at the sight of our sim hearted confidence in the integrity of the ancient text; and might hear them repeating that it was all over with our canon

539. But, to give a more exact and precise idea of this war, us not confine ourselves to general terms. Let us examine n closely, for example, what all the Protestant doctors in Germa who, during a hundred years, had constituted themselves guides of youthful theologians, have taught on this point. this purpose we cannot do better than pass rapidly in rev "the literature of the introductions to the New Testament," c tained in *Hertwig's Tables*,[1] published in 1849. Let us then, what all these guides respecting the canon, all these *in ducers (introducteurs)* of the German youth to this sacred st from the time when John David Michaëlis was appointed fessor in the University of Göttingen, in 1751, and Solo Semler, in Halle, in 1760, to our own days—Michaëlis, Sem Eichhorn, Hug, Haenlein, Schmidt, Feilmoser, Bertholdt, Wette, Guericke, Scholt, Credner, Neudecker, Reuss, B Schwegler,—I only pass over in this list Hug and Feilmoser, cause they are Roman Catholics, and Haenlein, because Hert who never cites him, has placed this remark against his nam "Of little importance."

[1] Literatur der Einleitungswissenschaft. Tabellen zur Einleitung ins Testament. Berlin, 1849.

540. What, then, is the result of the studies of these coryphaei in German science during a hundred years? They have all, without exception, attacked the canon, yet without coming to any agreement on the points assailed; one receiving what the other rejects.[1]

I ask, then, what would have become of our sacred canon, such as God has maintained in all the churches throughout the world for 1400 years, if it had been abandoned, during the course of the last hundred years, to any conclave of German sceince? Let us go over the long list of these "*introducers.*"

541. (1.) The most ancient, and, perhaps, the most illustrious, *John David Michaëlis,*[2] professor at Göttingen for forty years, expressed doubts of the canonical value of the Epistle to the Hebrews, (vol. iv., p. 248,) of the Epistle of James, (p. 302,) of the Epistle of Jude, (p. 418,) and of the Apocalypse, (p. 506.)

(2.) *Solomon Semler,* in 1757, in his *Apparatus ad Liberalem N. T. Interpretationem,* traced the road of rationalism for his age. At the same time, he denied the authenticity of many books of our canon; among others, of the Apocalypse, (1769,) and of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He made three epistles of the second to the Corinthians.

(3.) *John Gottfried Eichhorn,* professor at Göttingen, from 1804 to 1827, denied, in his *Introduction,* the authenticity of the two first chapters of Luke's Gospel, the two last chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, the First and Second Epistle of Peter, the two Epistles to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus.

(4.) *Christian Schmidt,* in 1804, in his *Historical and Critical Introduction to the New Testament,*[3] attached himself to the school of Semler. He denied the authenticity of the Second

[1] I ought not to except from this statement the respected Guericke; because, in his *Beiträge,* he denied the authenticity of the Second Epistle of Peter, though he afterwards nobly retracted this opinion. It is gratifying to read the beautiful expressions at the end of his preface. It required courage thus to return to the ancient truth. The author, in his first work, applied himself to the laborious task of combating De Wette's *Lehrbuch.* In the last, he refutes what has been called the new Tubingen school.

[2] Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften der Neuen Bundes, Gottingen, 1788. Translated by Dr Herbert Marsh.

[3] Giessen, 1804, 1805.

Epistle of Peter, the First Epistle to Timothy, of the two f chapters of Luke's Gospel, and of the Second Epistle to Thessalonians.

(5.) *Leonhardt Bertholdt*, in 1826,[1] doubted of the Sec Epistle of Peter, like Ullman and Olshausen; but, like them, did not reject it.

(6.) *W. M. Leberecht de Wette.* This illustrious and lear professor of Bâle, so faithful an interpreter in his admir translation of the Scriptures—so exact in his expositions, and rich in his materials, is, nevertheless, among the learned men have expressed most doubts respecting the canon. He has pressed them on the authenticity of the Gospels of Matthew Luke, of the Acts of the Apostles, of the First and Second Epis of Peter, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the Epistles to Timo of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and of the Apocalypse.[2]

(7.) *Ferdinand Guericke*,[3] in 1828 and in 1843, had expres in his *Beiträge*, like Bertholdt, doubts on the authenticity of

[1] Historische Brit., Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T., 1826. 2 vols.

[2] I do not here speak of his innumerable negations on the Old Testam (Lehrbuch der Einl. in die Bucher des A. T. Funfte Ausgabe, Berlin, 1840.) to the *Pentateuch*, it has, according to him, many indications of popular lege (§ 146;) the miracles did not occur as they are narrated, (§ 145;) *Deutero* and *Numbers* present contradictions to the preceding books; *Genesis* was wri between the time of David and that of Joram; *Leviticus* betrays the epoch of captivity of the ten tribes, and *Deuteronomy* that of Josiah, (§ 160;) the opi expressed in the New Testament, that Moses was the author of the Pentate is of no value for criticism, (§ 163;) as to the book of *Joshua*, its recitals ha mythological character, (§ 166;) as to the book of *Judges*, it was compiled after that of *Joshua*, (§ 175;) as to the book of *Kings*, it is more a moral p than a historical narrative, (§ 184;) as to the books of *Chronicles*, they are piled in a spirit of partiality to the priesthood, (§ 192;) as to the Book of *Rut* is posterior to the epoch of David, (§ 194;) as to *Isaiah*, the twenty-six chapters cannot be authentic, (§ 208;) as to *Jeremiah*, many passages in the could not have been written by him, (§ 216;) as to *Ezekiel*, many of the phecies it contains are only literary productions, (§ 223;) as to the histor *Jonah*, it is borrowed from a popular tradition, (§ 229;) as to *Daniel*, he was the author of the book that bears his name; and that book, which has som lation to that of the Maccabees and the Sibylline books, is of the age of Antio Epiphanes, (§ 255;) as to the *Psalms*, many of them are only simple imitati (§ 270;) and as to *the Song of Songs*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *the Proverbs*, prob Solomon was not the author. Lastly, as to *Job*, it is a production of the tivity, (§ 291.)

[3] Beiträge zur histor. krit. Einleitung ins N. T. Halle, 1828. Leipzig, 18

Second Epistle of Peter; but in his new *Introduction*, of the date 1854,[1] he has *explicitly retracted* them.[2]

(8.) *Augustus Schott*, in 1830,[3] in his *Isagogue*, denies the authenticity of the Apocalypse, of the end of the Gospel of Mark, (xvi. 9–20,) of the Epistle of James, and of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which he attributes to Luke.[4]

(9.) *Augustus Credner*, in his *Introduction*, published at Halle in 1836, adopted the principles of De Wette, and pursued the same course. "The attacks of Credner and the new Tubingen school against the authenticity of Mark," says Guericke,[5] "result from a *hypercriticism*, without a historical foundation." He also denies the authenticity of the two epistles to Timothy, of the Apocalypse, and of the Second Epistle of Peter.

(10.) *Gottlieb Neudecker*, who published his *Introduction* in 1840,[6] follows in Credner's footsteps, and denies the authenticity of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[7] and of the Second Epistle of Peter.[8]

(11.) *Edward Reuss*, professor of theology at Strasburg, who lately published (1853) at Brunswick a *History of the Holy Scriptures*,[9] of which the first edition appeared at Halle in 1842, also published, in 1840, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. The pretended Gospel of Matthew (he says) is taken in part from the Hebrew original, which contained the discourses (not the facts) reported in the actual Gospel. That of Mark is a revision of a true Gospel, and as to those which are called Luke's and John's, we have no assurance that Luke wrote the one or John the other. The narrative of Paul's journeys is by another hand

[1] Gesammtgeschichte des N. T. Leipzig, 1854.

[2] "Den ich hiemit wiederholt retractire," p. 483.

[3] Isagogue Historico-crit. in Lib. Nov. Fœd. Jena, 1830.

[4] Guericke, § 24, p. 396, names also Schott as having adopted Eichhorn's hypothesis, that the Pastoral Epistles were composed after Paul's death.

[5] Gesammtgeschichte des N. T., 1854, (2d ed.,) p. 147.

[6] Lehrbuch der historisch kritischer Einleitung. Leipzig, 1840.

[7] That is, he believes it to have been written by a Jewish Christian of Alexandria versed in the philosophy of Philo.

[8] Hertwig, Introd. p. 2, without taking any other notice of Neudecker, simply says, "Steht ganz auf Credner's Schultern." But see in the original work, Matthew, § 27; Mark, § 32; 2 Peter, § 134; Hebrews, § 114.

[9] Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften. Brunsw., 1853. 3d. ed., 1860.

than the rest of the Book of Acts; and in the Gospel called Jo the sentiments attributed to Jesus belong as to their form to compiler, who only makes use of Him to propagate his pers views. These are, together with those of James and Paul, oppo types of Christian thought. He admits a *Johannean Theo* by the side of a *Jewish-Christian* and a *Pauline Theolo* He strove equally between the Jewish Christianity of James, the liberal Christianity of Paul. As to the Epistle to the Hebr its tendency is Jewish-Alexandrine, and the idea it expresse the priesthood of Jesus is not that of Paul. The Second Ep of Peter is long after Peter's time, and as to the First, the which Peter took in it cannot be established. The authenticit the Second and Third Epistles of John is uncertain, while Apocalypse, which is not by him, is only a poetic represents of the hopes of the persecuted Church, and "confines itself tirely within the circle of the concrete and material hopes of synagogue."

(12, 13.) *Christian Baur*, in 1845 and 1847, and *Schwe* in 1846, both doctors of the new Tubingen school, against w Guericke has so honourably set himself, have both publi *Introductions;* the former, in 1845, on St Paul, under the of *Critical Inquiries on the Canonical Epistles;*[2] the latte 1846, under the title of *The Post-apostolic Age.*[3] These doc and their adherents have pushed their attacks much further t any other school in Germany in our day. In their eyes Gospels are documents without authority, and yet contradic documents, which aim at propagating the divergent doctrine their respective authors. They both reject St Paul's three Past Epistles and his Epistle to the Philippians, which belonged i tendency to the pretended John, whose Gospel Schwegler a

[1] Reuss is not mentioned by Hertwig, except in p. 2, in the list of autho Introductions. But we believe that we have correctly expressed his v according to his writings. See §§ 92, 196 on Matthew, § 189 on Mark, § 21 Luke, §§ 219, 226, 229, on John. Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostoliqu v., ch. ii., xvii. On the Epistle to the Hebrews, § 151; on 1 Peter, § 149 2 Peter, § 255; on James, Theol. Chrét., liv. vi., ch. 4; on the Apocalypse, §

[2] Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Stuttgard, 1845. Kritische Untersuchu über die kanonischen Evangelien. Tubingen, 1847.

[3] Das nachapostol. Zeitalter. Tubingen, 1846.

butes to Montanism. Baur calls in question too the two Epistles to the Thessalonians the Epistle to Philemon and the two last chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Schwegler considers the Epistle of James to have been composed late in the second century, and denies the authenticity of that of Jude, as well as of that to the Hebrews. Both reject the Epistle to the Colossians, and place the First Epistle of Peter in the second century, as being a production designed to reconcile the respective partisans of the two apostles. This school recognises as authentic, among Paul's epistles, only the Epistle to the Romans, (curtailed of the two last chapters,) the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians; because the others do not bear traces sufficiently clear of the opposition which must exist between the respective theories of Peter and of Paul.

542. Such, then, has been the voice of the leaders of theological science for a century among the Germans. There is not one book of the New Testament, the Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Galatians excepted, which their Introductions have not attacked; as there is not one of these guides, unless, perhaps, Haenlein, who has not in his turn lifted up his voice against some part of the canon.

Against *Matthew*—Schultz, (1814;) Schleiermacher, (1832;) Schneckenburger, (1832;) Lücke, (1832;) Neudecker, (1840;) De Wette, (1848;) Reuss, (1853;) and we may perhaps add Neander, (*Life of Jesus.*)

Against *Mark*—Neudecker, (1840;) Credner, (1836;) Schwegler, (1846;) Reuss, (1843;) and others.

Against *Luke*—Schmidt, (1804;) Eichhorn, (1827;) Schleiermacher, (1832;) De Wette, (1818, 1834;) Baur, (1845–1847;) and others.

Against *John*—Vogel, (1801;) Cludius, (1808;) Bretschneider, (1820;) De Wette, (1830, 1834;) Schwegler, (1846;) and others.

Against *the Acts*—De Wette, (1818;) Credner, (1836;) Baur, (1845;) Schwegler, (1846;) Reuss, (1853;) and others.

Against *the Epistle to the Romans*—(the two last chapters)—Semler, (1767;) Eichhorn, (1810;) Schultz, (1824;) Baur, (1845.)

Against *the Epistles to the Corinthians*—the unity only has

been denied. Semler (1767) makes several epistles of the seco
Paulus makes three, and Michel Weber makes two, (1798, 18

Against *the Epistle to the Philippians*—Schrader, (18
against the chapters iii., iv. 9; Baur, (1845;) Schwegler, (18

Against *the Epistle to the Ephesians*—De Wette, (181
Baur, (1845;) Schwegler, (1846,) of the Tubingen school.

Against *the Epistle to the Colossians*—Mayerhoff, (18
Baur, (1845;) Schwegler, (1846.)

Against *the First Epistle to the Thessalonians*—Baur, (18
1847.)

Against *the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*—Schm
(1804, 1805;) De Wette,[1] (1818;) Baur, (1845, 1847.)

Against *the First Epistle to Timothy*—Schleiermacher, (180
Eichhorn, (1812;) De Wette, (1826;) Schott, (1830;) Nean
(1832;) Credner, (1836;) Baur, (1845;) Schwegler, (1846.)

Against *the Second Epistle to Timothy*—Eichhorn, (181
De Wette, (1826;) Credner, (1836;) Baur, (1845;) Schweg
(1846.)

Against *the Epistle to Titus*—Eichhorn, (1812;) De We
(1826;) Baur, (1845;) Schwegler, (1846.)

Against *the Epistle to Philemon*—Baur, (1845.)

Against *the Epistle to the Hebrews*—Semler, (1767;) Sch
(1818;) De Wette, (1826;) Schwegler, (1846;) and others.

Against *the Epistle of James*—De Wette, (1826;) Sch
(1830;) Kern, (1835;) Schwegler, (1846.)

Against *the First Epistle of Peter*—Cludius, (1808;) Eichh
(1812,) believes it was digested by Mark; Schwegler, (1846,)
the Tubingen school, reckon this epistle among the productions
the second century, designed to reconcile the partisans of Pe
and of Paul; De Wette, (1818,) and Reuss, (1853,) think it
to be in harmony with the history or character of Peter.

Against *the Second Epistle of Peter*—Schmidt, (1804;) Ei
horn, (1812), Olshausen, (1822;) Ullman, against the second
third chapters, (1821;) Bertholdt, against the second chap
(1826;) Guericke, (1828;) De Wette, (1818;) Mayerhoff, (183
Credner, (1836;) Neudecker, (1840;) Huther, (1852;) Re

[1] In the latter days of his life he has defended it in his commentary on 2 Th
Introd., pp. 2, 3.

(1853.)[1] But Guericke has explicitly retracted the doubts he at first expressed.

Against *the First Epistle of John*—Lange, (1797;) Cludius, (1808;) Bretschneider, (1820,)[2] see in it *Docetic* notions, and attribute this epistle, and the following ones, to John the *Presbyter*.

Against *the two short Epistles of John*—Paulus, (1829,)[3] and Credner, (1836,) believe the author to be a different person from the apostle.

Against *the Epistle of Jude*—Dahl, (1807;) Schwegler, (1846;) and others.

Against *the Apocalypse*—Semler, (1771;) Lange, (1797;) and Cludius, (1808;) De Wette, (1818;) Bretschneider, (1820;) Ewald, (1828;) Schott, (1830;) Credner, (1836;) Neander,[4] Lücke, (1852;) Reuss, (1853;) Diesterdick, (1860.)

543. I ask now, whether it was not to be expected that, at the voice of all these masters of scientific inquiry, issuing from these influential universities, many persons would come forward to request and obtain from the Churches a severe revision of the canon? For more than a hundred years there had been publicly resounding in the ears of the German nation so many bold negations, so many fantastic hypotheses, so many arbitrary systems, so many doubts, so many contemptuous accusations against this or the other book of the New Testament, against their authenticity, against their harmony, against their infallibility, against their wisdom—what do I say?—against their veracity! . . . . Was it not to be expected that, in the course of this long period, and after all the labours of these learned men, many persons would be heard, in different places, among their innumerable disciples, who, in their turn, had become pastors of all the German congregations, who would ask for the publication of revised New Testaments, as, elsewhere, the Old Testament, freed from its apocryphal books,

[1] Geschichte der heiligen Schriften, §§ 269 and 161.

[2] Probabilia de Evangelio et Epistolarum Indole, Lips., 1820, p. 166.

[3] Die drei Lehrbriefe von Johannes, p. 260, (Heidelb., 1829.)

[4] In his Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche, (2 vols., 4th ed., Hamburg, 1847,)—History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church. Translated by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols. London, 1851, (Bohn.) Vol. i., p. 396.

has been published with so much zeal and unanimity? I ask, what would become of the canon of the New Testament in the hands—I do not say of Semler, of De Wette, of Schwegler, of the Tubingen school,—but in the hands of Michaëlis, or Schleiermacher, or Reuss, or even of Neander?

544. And, consequently, I ask, is it not deserving of admiration, not only to behold our Testament, with its twenty-seven books, coming out of its long probation scathless, entire, and fixed more firmly in all our churches; but that, precisely at the time when the Holy Scriptures have been most rudely assailed in our seats of learning, the Lord has been pleased to magnify them more than ever, not only in Germany, but to the very ends of the earth!

Is it not in this very age, when scholars and critics have so fiercely attacked the Bible, that the Scriptures have been honoured and glorified, more than in any other, by the great deeds they have accomplished, the conversions they have effected, the souls they have renewed, the barbarous nations they have been the instruments of raising to civilisation and the Christian life? Do you not see powerful societies formed among all Protestant nations to translate the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament, and the twenty-seven of the New, into all the languages spoken under the sun; to place them within reach of all ranks, high and low; and to send them across all seas, to the farthest parts of the world? And has it not been, during this same period, that all our churches have witnessed other associations, equally powerful, springing up by hundreds, to proclaim this same Word, with its sixty-six books, among all nations, even the least known; to send ministers and missionaries to teach it in churches and schools, in private houses, and in streets?

May it not be said, that if the nineteenth century, to the middle of which we have arrived, ought to be designated in the history of human learning (*l'histoire de l'école*) as the age specially *of rationalism*, and *of attacks on the canon*, this same nineteenth century ought ever to be admired in the Church of the future, and designated specially *the age of missions, and of the Bible*?

Never, since the days of the apostles, have so many missions carried the gospel far and wide, and never has humanity beheld a

spectacle so grand and catholic, and withal so simple, pacific, and powerful, as that astonishing Bible Society, which, in Europe and America, has achieved, in fifty-six years, incomparable wonders. It has covered the whole earth with Bibles. It has risen noiselessly, like the sun, to pour on the world a flood of light. It publishes and circulates only one book; but that book it publishes and circulates in all languages spoken by men. It desires to leave not a nation under heaven destitute of it; it has translated it into 158 languages; it has already given it to tribes who had never before known a written language; and thus it continues to spread peacefully over the whole earth, from Labrador to Terra del Fuego, and China, by millions, the Old Testament of God, without any Apocrypha, and the New Testament of God, consisting of twenty-seven inspired books; holding forth its fraternal hand to all missionaries to spread everywhere with them the name of that Saviour to whom the whole earth is destined to belong.

Say, ye men of Christian benevolence, ye men of faith, if the contrast of the apparent triumphs of critical science, taking to pieces the Sacred Volume, book by book, bit by bit, and the real triumphs of religion, circulating it at the same time with so much reverence and love over the whole habitable globe—say, if this contrast is not greatly to the glory of God, and of His sacred canon. Say, if you do not recognise in it that Jesus Christ reigns at the right hand of the Father, and that He still watches over His Word, as in the days when He gave it. Say, if you do not see in these striking facts the manifest accomplishment of what John beheld in Patmos—"The angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people," (Rev. xiv. 6.)

Never has anything like this been seen on earth!

545. But in this general movement of return to the Scriptures and to the truth of God, do not imagine that Germany herself has remained behind. On the contrary, see pious pastors resettled on the basis of faith, preaching with zeal to their roused and sympathising flocks the word of grace. See in how many places the mists of rationalism, which had so long obscured the German soil, have vanished before the rays of the Sun of righteousness, and

allowed us to admire the dawnings of a beautiful day. See, while so many students have quitted the universities full of prejudices against this or the other of our sacred books,—see a multitude of young servants of God, wholly devoted to Jesus Christ, issuing from the institutions of Bremen, Leipsic, Dresden, Berlin, and Hermansberg, who, bidding farewell to their fatherland, have sailed from the ports of Germany with the book of God in their hands, to preach it amidst the snows of Greenland, or on the burning soil of the Antilles, China, and India. Look only at the Missionary Society at Bâle pursuing its labours for fifty-four years, lending its noble labourers to other societies in England, Holland, and the north of Germany, while it maintains its own missionaries in the Indian stations of Canara, the Mahrattas, and Malabar, in towns of Africa almost unknown to geography, and in the Chinese stations of Hong-Kong and Canton.

I have, then, reason to say that if the New Testament with its twenty-seven books has never been so ill-treated before in the schools of human learning, never has it been so exalted by the piety of the churches, and the blessing of God. Human learning has thrown it into the lions' den, but it has come forth like Daniel on whom "no hurt was found;" it has been thrown into the fiery furnace, but it has come forth like the three Hebrew youths, "upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was a hair of their head singed." It has suffered no harm; the smell of fire has not passed upon it; the flames have only consumed the bonds with which it was bound, and "the form of the Son of God may be seen walking with it in the midst of the flames." Truly, O Lord, wonderful are Thy ways; and when to our weak and short sight Thy Word appears weak, it is then strong, and performs its mighty works.

Let us, then, acknowledge that the same God of the Scriptures, who watched over the canon for so many ages, has protected it more than ever in the age that has just expired.

546. Yet, before concluding about the fortunes of the Holy Book in Germany, that interesting and noble country of intellectual labour and erudition, it is needful I should say, that if in this land of literary freedom criticism has given scope to all its worse fancies, and if there is not one of our twenty-seven books which it

has not attacked, there is not one which the same science has not defended. For every book there has been a host of learned men on one side, and a host on the other. It is not science that has formed the canon, nor can science alter it; but it can at least contribute powerfully to defend it. I might pass under review those men of science who, in the schools of Germany, defend the different parts of the canon which others assail. By the side of Neander disputing the Apocalypse, and of the learned men such as Semler, Schott, Ewald, De Wette, Reuss, or Credner, who vied in attacking it, I could name its numerous advocates—Storr, Häulein, Hartwig, Lüderwald, Lange, Eichhorn himself, Schwegler, Bertholdt, Hävernick, (1834,) Ebrard, (1845,) Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Guericke, (1854.) By the side of Schmidt, Eichhorn, De Wette, Credner, Mayerhoff, attacking the Second Epistle of Peter, I could name Pott, Augusti, Thiersch, Dietlein, and Guericke who defend it. I could name Storr, Meyer, Paulus, Olshausen, Gelpke, Stendel, who defend the Epistle to the Hebrews; Storr, Gabler, and even Eichhorn, and Credner, as well as Guericke, who defend the Epistle of James.

But, if we have admired that manifest Providence which among Protestants, with all their irreverent freedom, has not ceased to preserve in its integrity the volume of the New Testament, we shall receive testimonies of the same Providence no less striking, if we proceed to consider the course of things in the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ATTEMPTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME AGAINST THE SCRIPTURES, COMPARED WITH HER RESERVE TOWARDS THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, STRONGLY ATTEST THE DIVINE AGENCY BY A NOVEL CLASS OF FACTS.

547. *Sixth Fact.*—We may assert that we shall gain a still more powerful proof than the preceding, from these endeavours of Rome, if we view them in connexion with her constant blamelessness in reference to the canon and the Greek text of the New Testament.

But here we wish our task and design to be clearly understood. We are writing this work simply in defence of the Sacred Volume, the common treasure of all the Churches under heaven, since all have absolutely the same collection. It is, then, their cause altogether that we have taken in hand, and it has not been our intention to enter into direct controversy. It was not without reluctance, and only yielding to the necessities of our argument, that in the foregoing chapter we brought forward the faults of Protestants, in order to prove the guardianship of Providence over the canon; and in the same spirit, and yielding to the same necessities, we are led to dwell, in the following pages, upon the still greater dangers among the followers of the Pope, which the sacred canon has, through Divine aid escaped. This must be borne in mind while listening to what we may say of the errors of the Church of Rome in reference to the Scriptures. We are led to do so by the course of our argument, and we might have said much more upon that subject.

548. The *negations* of Protestant theologians have just caused

us to admire the providence of God, in the noble unanimity of all the Churches throughout the world in maintaining the canon for 1500 years; but when we turn to the theologians of Rome, the same sentiments of admiration will be excited, and in a much higher degree.

Observe their incessant antipathies, and attempts of every kind against the Scriptures through a long succession of ages,—in what rank they have placed them,—what human traditions they have placed above them,—in how many ways they have contradicted them,—what insufficiency and injurious effects they have attributed to them. Observe what interpretations they have imposed upon them,—what impure persons they have constituted to be their judges,—what outrageous laws have been made to represent them as dangerous books. Observe what apprehension has been shewn at their circulation,—what care has been taken to prevent their being read,—what sanguinary laws have been enacted against pious persons convicted of the crime of vending them,—what orders to give them up,—what prohibitions of absolution to those who refused! Lastly, observe what solemn denunciations of all the later Popes, even in this nineteenth century, against those who circulate, and those who receive them.[1] Most assuredly, if you attentively consider the whole series of these facts, you will be forced devoutly to acknowledge, that God must have interposed His powerful hand in this matter, to have sheltered the collection of His twenty-seven books from every attack; and to have brought it about, that the Church which calls itself the sole guardian, depositary, and interpreter of a volume so dreaded and so discredited within its pale, should never have altered the canon, and never ceased, like ourselves, to preserve it in unalterable integrity. You will notice with admiration, that in all her criminal attempts against the oracles of the living God, she has never proposed either to take away, or to add any ancient book; she has never proposed, for example, that we should receive *the apocryphal Gospel of Peter*, or any other book in honour of the Virgin Mary, as the *apocryphal Gospel of Matthew*, or that of *James*, or that of *the Nativity*; she has never proposed that any of the books should be struck out

[1] Encyclical Letters of Leo XII. in 1824; of Gregory XVI. in 1832; of Pius IX. on his accession.

which are most at variance with her tenets; as, for example, Epistle to the Hebrews, (so directly opposed to her doctrine of mass, and to the sacerdotal character of her priests;) or second Epistle to the Thessalonians, which so clearly predicts idolatry and her fate; or the Apocalypse of John, so contra that future which she presents to the Church; or even other bo though she has often declared in her councils, that "gene circulated, the Holy Scriptures would do more harm than goo

549. We shall, above all, be struck with this thought, if we ourselves, how much easier for Rome must the undertaking seemed, to take away any book from the canon, or to add one than all that she has taken the liberty of doing against the Scriptures.

Let us pass under review her acts for six or eight centu and in contrast with such a picture, her blamelessness in refer to the canon will fill you with admiration.

SECTION FIRST.

HER DOGMAS AND RITES OPPOSED TO THE SCRIPTURES.

550. In the first place, she began by establishing a syste rites and dogmas in such flagrant opposition to the Script that they could not have gained acceptance except in commun entirely neglectful of the Holy Word, enslaved to the priests, among whom the imitation of pagan practices, and the show ancient Rome, had already supplanted a spiritual service. Fo celibacy; the monastic life; the worship of paintings or of ima and their incessant miracles; the sacerdotal office attributed priests and bishops; the adoption of the altars and costume pagan Rome—its votive offerings, its pontiffs, its chaplets, its cessions, its portable altars, its candles in broad day; the use liturgy in an unknown tongue; the idea of a sacrifice acc plished by the priest, and often repeated; the idea of ano expiation than the death of Jesus; the magical power ascribe the priests; the invention of the mass, and of the transubstan tion of the bread and wine at the supper; the adoration of

[1] The fourth of the ten rules drawn up by the fathers chosen at the Coun Trent, and approved by Pius IV.

metamorphosed bread; the withholding of the cup from the laity; the rule of not celebrating the supper except for money; this same supper performed in honour of the dead; the masses in which a traffic is carried on between the convents and the priests; the confessional, its mysteries, its interrogatories, its abominable impurities, and its still more abominable absolutions. The extermination of heretics by fire and sword, (*puniantur in ignem;*) the cancelling of promises, safeguards, and oaths, when deemed contrary to the interests of the Church, (*non quasi juramenta, sed quasi perjuria.*) The worship of angels and that of the dead; the prayers addressed to them in the *Missal*; their power in heaven, and their omnipresence on earth, to hear at all times, and in all places, the invocations made to them. The distinction of different kinds of religious adoration, *dulia*, *latria*, and *hyperdulia;* then, *dulia*, relative, and *latria*, (relative by means of images,) after the manner of the ancient idolatries. The queenly dignity of a female in heaven; her power above angels; her resurrection before the last day, her exemption from original sin; the eternal Wisdom (of the Book of Proverbs) identified in the *Breviary* with that humble and blessed woman, whom we behold, after the Lord's resurrection, praying with the brethren and sisters of the Church, (Acts i. 14,) and of whom none of the apostles afterwards say a word in any of the one-and-twenty letters which they wrote to the churches of God during the first sixty years of Christianity. The pagan invention of a purgatory, of an expiatory fire, in which horrible sufferings (*atrocissimæ*)[1] are inflicted on believers for whom Christ died, and in the torments of which they must suffer for their sins during millions of years before they can enter the haven of rest; but with the possibility of coming out of it by means of masses said for money, after their death. The domination of priests over the Lord's heritage, a domination so forcibly reprobated by St Peter and St John, (1 Peter v. 3; 3 John 9;) the pretension that Peter believed himself to be the prince of the apostles and Christ's vicegerent; that this dignity and vicarship has a successor from age to age; that a successor has a right to rule over all the Churches throughout the world,—a successor who is to be in perpetuity a bishop of Italy, because

[1] Bellarmin.

Peter, whom we never read of in the Scriptures as having been at Rome, presided there twenty-five years—a successor, lastly, who, although he has often been one of the worst of men, (by the confession even of the doctors and councils of Rome,)[1] will ever be a bishop of bishops, and the vicar of Jesus Christ throughout the world

SECTION SECOND.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF ROME OPPOSED TO THAT OF THE SCRIPTURES.

551. In the second place, this Church, to maintain the inviolability of this whole assemblage of contradictions to the Scriptures, has proceeded to take a step against them still more outrageous—to arraign their infallibility, and to oppose to it her own. However clear the declarations of the written Word may be on any doctrine whatever, you must take care not to set them in opposition to the teachings of Rome, since she is the sole interpreter, and condemns severely all rational exercise of your private judgment to understand their meaning. She allows you to receive them only in the signification that she has fixed. Even all the priests, before they are admitted to consecration, take an oath to interpret them only in conformity with the unanimous consent of the fathers, (a consent which does not exist, and can no where be found.) "Let no one" the Council of Trent says in its third session, "presume to force the Scriptures to his own private meaning, contrary to that which has been held, and which is still held, by the holy Mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the sacred books." It is added, that delinquents will be denounced to the Ordinary, and punished according to the law; and, in consequence of this ordinance, the fourteenth article of the *Credo of Pius IV.* ends with these words—"I receive also

[1] To cite only one example among so many others, notice the judgment on Pope John XXIII., at the œcumenical Council of Constance in 1415. Tried on seventy counts, (all attested and proved,) he was convicted of many murders and poisonings, (among others, that of Alexander V., his predecessor,) of many adulteries and incests, (among others, with his sister-in-law, and some nuns.) "*A cloaca of vice,*" said the Council, "*and a mirror of infamy;*" Lorente, Hist. des Papes, Paris, 1822. Lenfant, Histoire du Conc. de Constance.)

the Holy Scriptures in the sense in which the holy Mother Church has held, and still holds them, who alone has the right to judge of their true sense, and of their interpretation. I will never receive or interpret them excepting in conformity with the unanimous consent of the fathers."

SECTION THIRD.

THE AVERSION OF ROME TO THE WRITTEN WORD.

552. In the third place, from this assumption of infallibility, there results for the Church of Rome, not only the fatal impossibility of ever reforming herself, and the necessity of being always in error, but, more than all, an instinctive aversion to the oracles of God. Hence arises the secret feeling of an organised and perpetual state of war between the interpretations of Scripture and that Scripture which will never cease to protest against the meaning she gives it. From this, too, arises the constantly disparaging language of the doctors of Rome respecting the written Word and its use. When do you hear them, unless among the Jansenists, (always more or less persecuted,) the Pascals, the Duguets, the Quesnels, the Sacys, use the language of Scripture respecting the Scripture. "O how love I thy law, my God! I meditate therein day and night. It is profitable for instruction, for correction, for conviction, for making the man of God ready for every good work, and wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus. It enlightens the eyes; it gives wisdom to the simple. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; search them with care daily, to see if what is preached to you agrees with them."[1] Alas! instead of this language respecting the Bible—language which has been that of pious men in all ages—you see them decrying its use, lowering it in the popular estimation, speaking of it as obscure, insufficient, and even dangerous. Of what use to circulate it among the people? Have they not the priests? It is insufficient to instruct, to convince, to correct, to make wise unto salvation; it is not the business of the people to examine whether what is preached to them is conformable to it. Is not that known beforehand? "It is obscure," Bellarmin

[1] Ps. xix. 8; cxix. 105, 130; 2 Tim. iii. 15–17; John v. 39; Acts xvii. 11.

affirms;[1] "it does not contain everything necessary to salvation," he adds; "it belongs to the Mother Church to decide upon the meaning." "It is dangerous," say the Roman councils, "if you circulate it indiscriminately; to read it without permission is a mortal sin." "It is exposing one's self, on account of human infirmity, to receive more harm than good," says the Council of Trent.[2] "It is made evident by experience," Pius VII. repeats, at a later period, in his bull to the Archbishop of Gnesen,[3] "that the Holy Scriptures, circulated in the vulgar tongue, have produced, through the rashness of men, more evil than good." And Pius IX., from the time of his accession, has hastened to repeat these deplorable and fatal maxims.

Section Fourth.

THE ANXIETY OF ROME TO KEEP THE BIBLE AT A DISTANCE FROM THE PEOPLE, AND THE PEOPLE FROM IT.

553. In the fourth place, another attempt of Rome against the Scriptures, is the pains it has always taken to keep them at a distance from the people, and the people from them; contriving that even the priests do not know them, except by the extracts inserted in the *Breviary*, the *Pontifical*, and the *Missal*, and thus making them to disappear almost entirely from every country where there are no Protestants—from Spain, Portugal, Italy, the colonies of America and Asia, Peru, Mexico, Paraguay, Brazil, Cuba, the Philippines, and, above all, from Rome, the mother city.[4] Alas! as far as relates to the Holy Scriptures, all these countries, by the efforts of this Church, have been reduced to a desert, and the Bible has become a strange book—I might say, a suspected, a dangerous book. "I have gone through the whole city of Rome," said, a few years ago, a distinguished Englishman,

[1] De Verbo Dei, lib. iii., et lib. iv.

[2] See the bull of Pius IV., at the end of the Council of Trent, act. 14. Sacros et Œcum. Concil. Trident., Canones et Decreta. Paris, 1823.

[3] June 29, 1816.

[4] It is striking to read, in the official papers of the British parliament for the year of Catholic emancipation, (1829,) the examination of Drs Murray and Doyle, (afterwards prelates in Ireland,) on the entire absence of the Bible, in the vulgar tongue, in the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal, where they had long resided.

Mr Seymour, "and I have visted all the book-shops of that city, even those of second-hand booksellers Not a copy of the Scriptures! Everywhere the same answer—*E proibito; non è permesso!* Only in two places the edition of Martini was offered me; but in twenty-four volumes, at the price of 105 francs."[1]

554. But, in the fifth place, this hostility against the Scriptures has led the Church of Rome much further. "*Experience*," she said, at the Council of Trent,[2]—she said it 317 years later, at the Council of Toulouse,—she has repeated it very often in our own day,—"*Experience* has convinced her that the use of the Sacred Books, circulated freely in the vulgar tongue among the Christian congregations under her jurisdiction, has always been her ruin." Observe, therefore, when, in spite of her efforts to keep them from the Scriptures, she has seen them apply to their study in a spirit of earnest piety;—as, for example, the Vaudois in the twelfth century—the Albigenses in the thirteenth—the Lollards in the fourteenth—the Bohemians in the fifteenth—the Reformed Churches of Germany, France, England, Switzerland, Scandinavia, Poland, Hungary, Italy and Spain in the sixteenth—the Jansenists of

[1] See Seymour, Mornings with the Jesuits at Rome. London, 1849, p. 153. Luther tells us that it was at Erfurt, in the library of the university, to which he came to be made Master of Arts, that he met, for the first time, with a Bible. Excepting the fragments of the Gospels or epistles contained in the Missal, scarcely any one read the Word of God; and Luther himself tells us that he had never seen the whole of it. "Carlostadt," he adds, "began to read it only when he had been doctor for ten years," (Table-talk, vi., 7, quoted by Michelet.) But what he tells us there, three centuries and a half ago, has been told us within these few years, by one of the most learned priests of Rome, recently converted to the gospel, in the same way as Luther, by reading the Bible—the honourable M. de Sanctis. Though minister of one of the first parishes in Rome, (the *Maddalena*,)—though a doctor in theology, and universally respected—though a theologian of the Inquisition, and examiner of the clergy—though well versed in the theology of Thomas Aquinas, he had known the Bible hitherto only by extracts, such as were to be met in the services of the churches, and in theological works. "A contrivance of the devil to make the priests believe that they read the Bible," (he wrote to me,) "is to make them recite every day a part of the Breviary, composed of Psalms, and of sentences from the fathers, or the Holy Scriptures. Every day, after the psalm, they read three lessons taken from the Bible. These begin with the first chapter of Genesis, and end with the twenty-second chapter of the Apocalypse; so that the greater part of the clergy actually believe that they read the Bible through every year. I myself believed it."

[2] The fourth of the ten rules, drawn up by the fathers chosen at the Council, on the subject of *the prohibited books*; rules approved and published by Pius IV.

France in the seventeenth—the Tuscans and Irish in the r teenth;—observe how at once she takes the alarm; she forc defections; she trembles for her supremacy; she utters by t cries of menace and of alarm; she at last commits the imp act, before unheard of, that of interdicting, in the name of J Christ, to the disciples of Jesus Christ, the book of Jesus Chri

555. Never, no, never, since the commencement of Christia —never among all the most audacious sects which have hara the Church of God—never among the eighty-eight heresies merated by St Augustin,[1] has any one of them, even the impious of the Sabellians, Pelagians, or Arians abstained from pealing to the testimony of the Scriptures, and encouraging reading of them—never has any one dared to lift his voice ag their authority or their universal use. What do I say? N even before the canon was entirely formed, did the Gnostics, Ebionites, the Valentinians, the Marionites or the Manicha who rejected a part of the Scriptures, ever dream of interdic men from reading the books which they themselves held as g by God. On the other hand, the great Greek Church, which s herself *the orthodox Church of the East,* proclaims aloud the of reading the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and declares the Bible, being the Word of God, is *the sole supreme judge of troversies in matters of faith.*[2] But here, after so many ages see the Church of the Pope the only one in the world to inte Christian people from reading the Word of God.

She officially perpetrated this act now more than six centu ago. In 1229, at the Council of Toulouse, held against the Vau and Albigenses, under Gregory IX., she dared to pass against Scripture the frightful decree of which the following is the fo canon:—"We also prohibit laymen from having the books of Old and the New Testament, unless perhaps any one for devoti purposes wishes to possess a Psalter, or Breviary for Divine ser or the Hours of the Blessed Virgin. But we forbid them expr from having the books above mentioned translated into the vu

[1] De Haeres., tom. viii., pag. 3, Bened. edit., Paris, 1685.

[2] See Philaretus, (metropolitan of Moscow) in his Tableau Comparatif des E d'Orient et d'Occident; Pinkerton's Russia, London 1833, 39th, and follo pages.

tongue." (*Sed ne praemissos libros habeunt in linguâ vulgari translatos arctissimè prohibemus.*)

556. And that decree which established the Inquisition is renewed one century after another. The *experience* of Rome, as she herself reiterates, having from age to age convinced her of the incompatibility of her existence with the universal use of the oracles of God, she has often renewed such edicts under different forms. Here, for example, is what she declared in the middle of the sixteenth century in the name of the Council of Trent, on the fourth of the "rules" drawn up by the Fathers chosen for the question of prohibited books:[1]—"Since it is manifest by EXPERIENCE (*cum experimento manifestum sit*) that if the Holy Bible (*si Sacra Biblia*) in the vulgar tongue is circulated everywhere without distinction, *more harm than good* will result from it on account of the rashness of men, (*plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri,*) whoever shall have the presumption to *read such Bibles, or to possess them without permission, shall be disqualified for receiving absolution of his sins,* at least till *he has previously given up his Bible to the bishop of the diocese.*"

557. Thus, while in the ancient Church of the three first centuries, the unhappy men, who for fear of punishment delivered up their Bibles to the officers of *Pagan* Rome, were called *Traditores*, and were refused absolution of their sins, at the present day it is an act of piety in the estimation of *Papal* Rome to deliver them up; while for those who have the presumption to read them or to possess them without permission, the absolution of their sins is to be refused, and excommunication kept in reserve.

558. The Church of Rome has pursued this fatal policy with increasing hardihood, and, in the eighteenth century, the too famous bull, *Unigenitus*,[2] against Quesnel, received after a long contest by all parties of the Roman Church, condemned for ever, "as, each of them, false, deceitful, scandalous, pernicious, rash,

[1] De libris prohibitis regulae decem per patres a Tridentino Synodo delectos . . . (Sacros et Œcum. Conc. Trid., Paul. III., Jul. III., et Pio IV., Pont. Max. Celebrati, Canones et Decreta, Paris, 1823.) Pius IV., in the bull that accompanies these rules, declares that "it is a mortal sin to violate them."

[2] Or the "Constitution of Clement XI. against Quesnel," Sept. 8, 1713.

suspected of heresy, savouring of heresy, heretical, impious, blasphemous, the following propositions:"—

The 79th. "It is useful, at all times, in all places, and for all sorts of persons, to study the Scripture, and to know its spirit, devotion, and mysteries."

The 80th. "The obscurity of God's Holy Word is not a reason for laymen to dispense with reading it."

The 84th. "To take the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to keep it closed from them, by depriving them of the means of understanding it, is to close for them the mouth of Jesus Christ."

The 85th. "To interdict Christians the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and especially of the Gospels, is to interdict the use of light to the children of light, and to make them suffer a species of excommunication."

Again, in the nineteenth century, we have heard the disastrous professions of all the last popes, to consecrate their accession to the throne by a declaration of hatred against the Bible Societies, and the dissemination of the Scriptures; the Bull of Pius VII, addressed, June 29, 1816, to the primate of Poland; the encyclicals of Leo XII., May 3, 1824; of Gregory XVI., Aug. 15, 1832; and, lastly, of Pius IX., to the archbishops and bishops of Italy, in 1849. "To arrest this pestilence," says Leo XII., (the pestilence of the universal dissemination of the vulgar tongue,) "to arrest this pestilence, of which the effect is, that, by perverse interpretations, the Gospel of Christ is converted into a human gospel, or, rather, into a gospel of the devil, our predecessors have published many constitutions, tending to shew how very injurious this perfidious invention is, both to faith and morals." (*Quanto-perè fidei et moribus vaferrimum hocce inventum noxium sit.*)

Section Fifth.

THE LONG AND CRUEL SEVERITIES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME INFLICTED ON THOSE WHO WISH TO READ THE SCRIPTURES IN THE VULGAR TONGUE.

559. But this is not all. In her warfare against the Scriptures, Rome has gone much further. Here is a sixth feature of her

hostility. Persuaded that the possession of the Bible, in the vulgar tongue, by the people would be her ruin, she has been in the practice everywhere, for 600 years, of punishing, first, with excommunication, and, when she has the power, with death, all those who choose to possess it, or take the liberty of reading it.

560. You can see, in the great collection of her bulls,[1] those of Honorius III., in 1216; of Innocent IV., in 1243; of Alexander IV., in 1254; of Urban IV., in 1262; of Clement IV., in 1265; of Nicholas III., in 1278; of John XXII., in 1317; of Boniface IX., in 1391; of Martin V., in 1418; of Innocent VIII., in 1486; of Julius II., in 1511; of Leo X., in 1520; of Clement VII., in 1526; of Paul III., in 1536; of Julius III., in 1550; of Paul IV., in 1550 and 1559. See in "The Acts of the Councils," by Labbe and Cossart,[2] the Fourth Lateran Council, in 1515; the edict of St Louis, in 1228; the Council of Toulouse, under Pope Gregory IX., in 1229; of Beziers, in 1246; of Oxford, in 1408; of Constance, in 1415, 1416, and 1418; of Sienna, in 1527.

561. The decree of Toulouse, 1229, as we have already quoted it, forbidding to every layman the reading of the Old and the New Testament, odious as it is for the audacity of its impiety, is still more so for its *ferocity;* and this is a seventh feature. It established the horrible tribunal of the Inquisition against all the readers of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. It was an edict of fire, bloodshed, and devastation. In its 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters, it ordained the entire destruction of the houses, the humblest places of concealment, and even the subterranean retreats of men convicted of possessing the Scriptures; that they should be pursued to the forests and caves of the earth; and that even those who harboured them should be severely punished. ("*Etiam sint domini terrarium soliciti circa inquisitionem haereticorum in villis domibus et nemoribus faciendam; et circa hujusmodi appensa adjuncta seu subterranea latibula destinenda.*")

562. And do not think that this ferocity against the Scriptures was the paroxysm of a day. Rome has kept it up for ages, and indulged in it as far as the laws of European nations have per-

[1] Magnum Bullarium Romanum, Luxemburgi, 1727, (Biblioth. de l'Athénée.)
[2] Paris, 1671, fol. 16.

mitted it. Thousands of martyrs have perished by her han their attachment to the Holy Word. Her priests, in p them to death, have believed "they did God service," as Christ said, (John xvi. 2.) This persuasion, founded, as said, on a long EXPERIENCE, that the circulation of the Scri is more powerful against their system of religion than the a of infidelity, or of philosophy, or of earthly powers have ever —this persuasion has led them to destroy so great an evil a price, to combat it, for conscience' sake, by fire and sword. you still hear, in the present day, even in France, the jo most prized by the Church of Rome, and the most approv presentatives of her doctrines, loudly defending those in butcheries.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE DECREES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME REDUCE THE SCRIP TO A LEVEL WITH TRADITIONS.

563. But Rome has advanced still further against the Word. Not satisfied with interdicting the use of it to the p she has sought to degrade it. To be able to contradict i words of men must be raised to the same level; and this is the Council of Trent has done. It has put in the same ra the Word of God, the immense, and, to this day, undefined, of human documents to which the name of TRADITION has given; this has been so done as to annul the divinity of Holy by recognising, as equally Divine, other innumerable and ap phal teachings, which annul its eternal authority by attempti share it. There are two ways of denying God—either by low Him to the rank of the creature, or by elevating the creat His side, and to His throne. This is what the Council of has done.

Look at the first decree of its fourth session—"Seeing (it that saving truth and the discipline of manners are contain WRITTEN BOOKS, and in UNWRITTEN TRADITIONS, which, rec by the apostles from the lips of Jesus Christ, or by the inspi of the Holy Spirit through the succession of time, are come to us—the Council, following the experience of the apo fathers, RECEIVES WITH THE SAME SENTIMENT OF PIETY,

REVERENCE, (*pari pietatis et reverentiae affectu,*) and honour[1] ALL THE BOOKS OF THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT, (seeing that God was their Author,) and with them the TRADITIONS concerning both FAITH and manners.

564. All Christian Churches protest against this attempt, and particularly the great Russo-Greek Church, which terms itself the Orthodox and Catholic Church of the East. "This," it says, "is the eighth of the nineteen errors that separate the Roman Church from the great Orthodox Church of the East."[2]

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE DECREES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME PLACE THE SCRIPTURES BELOW THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

565. But Rome not only makes the Scriptures descend to her own level, but sets herself above them, by constituting herself their infallible interpreter and supreme judge, claiming for her decisions, even for the most palpably erroneous, the infallibility which belongs to God alone. This is our eighth point. By a bull she has publicly classed among *the heresies of Luther* his having said that it was not in the power either of the Church or the Pope to establish articles of faith.[3] Tradition is always consulted to determine the meaning of the Bible, but the Bible is never consulted to give its judgment on tradition. What should we lose, then, in the judgment of Rome, if the Bible were everywhere abandoned — since the Church has already determined by an

[1] Can. et Dec. Concil. Trident., p. 16; Lipsiae, 1816.

[2] See the work of the late metropolitan Archbishop of Moscow, quoted above, (Propp. 475-478.) Eight of these nineteen errors relate to the Scriptures. The first which the Archbishop points out is, that in the Latin Church, the Bible is held not be a sufficient source of the truths necessary to salvation. The second, that the apocryphal books are made part of the canon. The third, that the Scriptures are asserted to be unintelligible without an interpreter. The fourth, that instead of the original text, the Latin version, called the Vulgate, authorised by the Council of Trent, is received as the authentic text. The fifth, that the laity are forbidden to read the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. The sixth, that the Pope is constituted supreme judge of controversies. The seventh, that the same infallibility is given to the decisions of councils as to Jesus Christ. Lastly, the eighth is, that unwritten traditions are received with the same reverence as the written Word of God.

[3] The Bull *Exsurge* of Leo X. in 1520; Council. Harduini, tom. ix., p. 1893.

infallible voice all that constitutes the truth—and since her n renowned doctors declare that the Scripture is not necessary, t it is insufficient, obscure, imperfect, even dangerous for faith manners, the inexhaustible source of disputes and heresies- that to read it without the permission of the priest, is, accord to the councils,[1] a mortal sin, and the booksellers who venc ought to be severely punished?

Section Eighth.

THE POWER OF ALL THESE FACTS UNITED TO CONFIRM T DOCTRINE OF THE CANON.

566. Such, then, have always been the increasing attacks of Church of Rome upon the Scriptures, for six or eight hund years. And now, I ask, does not this warfare of eight centu render the blamelessness of Rome as to the text and canon of New Testament admirable, astonishing, and marvellous? A this warfare Rome carries on more eagerly than ever, especi since the re-establishment of the Jesuits by Pius VII.; although temporal power of nations no longer seconds it by their laws, a the circulation of the Bible all over the world has made so m nificent a progress!

The Scriptures circulated by our societies have been publi inscribed in the list of prohibited books; they have been den entrance into various countries with far more strictness than works of Diderot or Voltaire; and the Bible in the vulgar tong is always, for the Papacy, the most dangerous book it has to d with. Listen to the cries of alarm from the four last popes this subject, and you will see that this ancient and formida power, which still makes the powers of this world tremb trembles itself before the Scriptures laid open in the vulg tongue. It quails at the thought of appearing in public bef their tribunal. For 1200 years the Scriptures have not be allowed to be seen by a priest, excepting under the veil of a de language; and, in the same way, they have not been allowed

[1] Peccatorum absolutionem percipere non possit. (*De libris prohibitis.*) Regu Decem per Patres a Tridentina Synodo delectos continuatæ et a Pio IV. comp batæ.

be read by the people excepting in fragments, and that in Latin, in the Vulgate version of Jerome.

567. I ask, then, any one who has watched this long hostility against the Word—a hostility, as Rome confesses, founded on experience, for ages, of its dangerousness—a hostility prolonged for eight centuries,—is it not marvellous that, in the midst of all these attempts against the Scriptures, that of altering the canon, by additions or retrenchments favourable to the doctrines of Rome, has never been tried?[1] Who would not have thought beforehand, that, among all these enterprises against the Scriptures, and their circulation, this of altering the canon would be of the number? that the Church of Rome would be glad, for example, to be relieved a second time of that Epistle to the Hebrews which is so decidedly opposed to the doctrine of the mass; and of that Apocalypse which represents Rome as a Babylon, and so clearly predicts her ruin? or that she should accept some of those apocryphal gospels which give glory to the Virgin Mary? or that she should be tempted to grant a place in the canon to the epistle of that *apostle Clement*, as Clement of Alexandria called him,[2]—that immediate successor of St Peter, as Jerome called him?[3] Truly, the hand of God must be acknowledged here in this reverence shewn for the canon in the midst of so much contempt and outrage against the Scriptures, at a time, too, when the fabrication of forged books was so frequent, and the alteration of genuine books was not less so, as we shall soon shew. Such an attempt, atrocious as it would have been, might have seemed, beforehand, much more probable than what has really happened; and these proceedings towards the books of the New Testament, especially in an obscure

[1] "Since the Church has approved the four Gospels," said the monks to Wickliffe, "she had also the power to reject them, and to admit others. The Church sanctions or condemns what she pleases. . . . . Learn to believe in the Church more than in the gospel."—*Merle D'Aubigné, Reformat.*, tom. v., p. 108.

[2] Ὁ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης. Stromata, iv., 17, § 107; ed. Klotz, ii., 334. See Hefel, Patrum Apost. Opera, Proleg., p. xxviii. Tubing., 1847.

[3] The popes certainly could not have added the epistle of Clement to the New Testament in 1345, or 1445, or 1545, because it had been lost in the West, and was not recovered till 1628. But this makes it more remarkable, that they should have allowed the ancient and memorable relic of a bishop of Rome to be lost, when the Eastern bishops held it in such honour that they were pleased to join it to the end of the New Testament. See Propp. 254–256.

age, when the Scriptures were so little known, and so few pers knew how to read, must seem much more profitable, and, co quently, far less improbable than all that has really happe Far less improbable, for instance, than forbidding Christians read or possess the Word of their God; far less improbable t ordering it to be given up to the priests, under pain of exc munication; far less improbable, especially, than an order to Christians to death, convicted only of the crime of reading possessing it; far less than the crime of putting the whole b of traditions on a level with it; far less than that of audacio belying it, and publicly placing above it the infallibility of Italian bishop, or that of some priests assembled in council. yet this act, comparatively so easy, so profitable to the priests, so much to be preferred to all that has been actually done, Church of Rome has never committed, nor even, as far as know, ever attempted to commit. And why? Because ther a God who watches over His oracles; because He guards t canon; because He prevents even the most rebellious Churc from laying their hands upon it; and because He had already vented, during 3300 years, in relation to the Old Testament, Jewish people, though almost always unfaithful, from committ such an outrage.

568. Thus the very errors of the Roman pontiffs, like thos Protestant theologians in reference to the Holy Word, have o served, in the final result, for its exaltation, and the confirmat of its canon. After all these storms of eight hundred ye storms which have sometimes deluged the earth, we see Thy H Word, like Noah's ark, floating above the waters, and advanc peacefully through the storms to renovate the world. God lent for a time to the science of the schools all its genius all its licence of action, as to the Church of Rome all its means violence and all its triumphs, only to furnish believers with t great and novel proofs of the divinity of the Scriptures, of Providence that protects them, and of the durability of their can The schools have revolted against the canon, but in vain; pri have agitated, but in vain; the laws of all the Latin kingdo have denounced death against those who circulate the Scriptures the vulgar tongue; pontiffs have launched their bulls; blood,

their outcries, has flowed like water; more recently, since the French Revolution which quenched their thunderbolts, they have not ceased to anathematise the Bible societies as a *vaferrimum inventum*, and as a pest by which, they say, the very foundations of religion are undermined.[1] But the Bible, in its integrity, has traversed the globe; the New Testament, with its canon intact and complete, has made the tour of the world to spread the gospel of grace in one hundred and sixty different languages; and the great society divinely charged with this incomparable mission has just accomplished it, and celebrated six years ago its fiftieth anniversary. Pacific and powerful in its exterior weakness, not having received the support of any human government, it has silently covered the world; it has continued to raise its waves as the ocean its tides; and when it was proposed at its jubilee to vote a million copies of the New Testament for China, which had just been opened to the sacred colporteurs, it hastened to accept the magnificent challenge, and took measures to circulate them during the year. Certainly as there is a God who has given the Scriptures, there is a God who watches over the volume that contains them and preserves it from age to age.

[1] The words of Pius VII. in his bull of 1816 against the Bible Society, given at Rome June 29, and addressed, as we have said, to the Bishop of Gnesen.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SEVENTH CLASS OF FACTS—THE PIOUS FRAUDS IN SUPPOR THE DOCTRINES AND PRETENSIONS OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF

569. THERE is still another class of facts which more than demands notice, in order to give our argument its greatest f This faithful preservation of the sacred collection, so surprisin the bloody hands of the Papacy during the twelve hundred sixty years of its triumphs, will appear to us much more ma lous when we have studied another permanent feature of its hist I refer to its pious frauds—incontestible frauds—frauds enorm official, and innumerable—frauds continued and multiplied du thirteen centuries with incessant ardour, to sanction in the eye the people the doctrines of its schools, and the pretensions o pontiffs.

False epistles,—false titles,—false acts of councils,—false b of the fathers,—false decrees,—false miracles,—false appariti —false legends!

And let us observe, that all these means have been emplo most frequently in connexion with what Paul calls "a zeal of G (ζῆλον Θεοῦ,) Rom. x. 2, and as the actors believed from holy tives, because in exalting the Church, according to their idea o they imagined that they were advancing the salvation of the wo and the glory of God.

570. Certainly, when at the end of thirteen whole centuries pious frauds practised under all forms, you still see the mig colossus of the Roman Church, always carrying in its hands holy and pure collection of the twenty-seven scriptures of the N Testament, you cannot help recognising in this marvellous invi bility, a manifestation of the God of the Scriptures. Certai

you have here before your eyes a splendid miracle of Providence. You see an ingot of silver come out uninjured with all its lustre from an immersion of ages in a corrosive acid, while every other substance, even gold, has been affected by it. We behold as it were Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego again coming forth from the furnace—"*upon their bodies the fire has had no power, neither has the smell of fire passed upon them,*" (Dan. iii. 27.)

571. But we must study this great fact more closely, to be able to do it justice. We wish, notwithstanding its wide extent, while presenting a clear and precise view of it, to be as brief as possible; for we are led to notice it only by the necessities of our argument; and in recalling the faults of Romanists, we feel almost the same repugnance as we always express whenever we are forced to mention those of Protestants. Besides, we do not forget that we are writing an apologetical and not a controversial work. Only it is needful that every reader should recognise the hand of God in this affair; and in order that he may recognise it, the marvellous contrast in the history of the Papacy must be pointed out to him; on the one hand all those falsehoods, and on the other, that constant and immaculate blamelessness in reference to the canon. This proof is glaring; it would be criminal to shut our eyes to it.

In order to call to mind in a few words these gigantic frauds, we shall cite only eminent Roman authorities and well-authenticated facts.

Section First.

THE FALSE DECRETALS.

572. For example, in the *first* place, the *False Decretals*, those letters fraudulently attributed to the popes of the three or four first centuries by those of the eighth and tenth; "a falsehood, of which the artifice," says the illustrious Abbé Fleury,[1] "deceived the whole Latin Church for 800 years." In the *second* place, the *false donation* of the city of Rome to the bishops of that city by Constantine the Great; a donation so often alleged by the popes of the Middle Ages, "and upon which," Fleury says again,

[1] Prior of Argenteuil and Confessor of Louis XV., in his Histoire Eccles., tom. vi., p. 506, and tom. xi., 4me discours.

"the popes primarily founded their temporal dominati
Thirdly, the false books attributed to fathers of the Churcl
the defenders of Rome, but acknowledged by the best author
be forged. *Fourthly*, the *true* books of the fathers, *falsified*
this same Church in the interest of these new doctrines, and f
fied even authoritatively by its official publications and its *In*
Expurgatorius. *Fifthly*, the *Roman Breviary* itself, as wel
the false narrations, the false citations, the false books, the f
miracles, which we find reproduced in it from year to year,
order of the Popes, to be read every day by the hundred thous
Latin priests who are obliged even at this day, over all
world, and under pain of mortal sin, to repeat it every day w
for word, and during the hours, all the sentences, in their d
devotions.

Certainly we see enough here to make all thoughtful r
admire the divine fact which we point out. But we must l
at it more closely.

573. It is well understood that the *Decretals* are epistles
which the popes reply to the consultations of bishops. T
are called decretals, because in the Church of Rome they have
force of law. And as to the *False Decretals*, they are let
fraudulently attributed by the popes of the Middle Ages to pc
of the three or four first centuries, in order to induce the be
that these first bishops then enjoyed the prerogatives which tl
successors did not claim till six, seven, or eight hundred y
after them. "Never," it has been said,—"never has the hist
of mankind presented the example of so gigantic a fraud; giga
in its boldness, gigantic in its duration, gigantic, above all, in
immensity of its success. This powerful and incomparable fa
hood established the domination of Rome throughout the Mi
Ages; and the artifice,"—I borrow once more the words of
confessor of Louis XV., the illustrious Abbé Fleury,—"the arti
deceived the whole Latin Church for 800 *years*, although th
is no one," he adds, "moderately informed in these matters, v
may not recognise the falsity in the present day."[1] We give l

[1] Tom. vi., lib. xliv., in the year 785. See also, for the False Decretals, Gies
Kirchengeschichte, ii., § 20. According to this historian, the compilation wa
the dates 829 and 845.

in his own words, but somewhat condensed, the account of it contained in his sixth book:—

"The successor of Fulrad in the Abbey of St Denys was Enguerran, Bishop of Metz. A collection of canons is attributed to him, bearing the name of Pope Hadrian, who gave them to him on September 19, 785. Other copies state that it was Enguerran who presented them to the Pope, which is much more probable. What distinguishes this from preceding collections is the extracts from the *False Decretals* of Isidore with which it is filled. And this is the first time we find these decretals made use of." Such is Fleury's account.

But we should read again in this author with what arrogance the Popes Nicholas and Hadrian (in 864 and 874) cited these fraudulent acts, to sustain their pretensions, to Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and to King Charles the Bald.

574. "The collection in which these acts are found" (I again quote Fleury) "bear the name of *Isidore Mercator*, who appears to have been a Spaniard. He says in the preface that he had been obliged to compile this work by eighty servants of God, and that, next to the canons of the apostles, he had inserted some decretal letters of the Popes Clement, Cletus, and others, down to Sylvester, (in 314.) But he does not say where he found them. They were unknown to Dionysius Exiguus, who had collected, 200 years before, the decretals of the Popes only since Siricius, (384.) Moreover, they bear evident signs of imposture. Their dates are almost all false; all are in the same style—more suited to the eighth century than the three first,—and full of different passages from authors later than the Popes whose names they bear. The contents of these letters equally expose the forgery; they speak of archbishops, primates, and patriarchs, as if these titles had been in use from the first rise of the Church; they prohibit holding any council, even a provincial one, without the Pope's permission; they represent appeals to Rome as common; they complain of frequent usurpations of the temporal property of the churches, &c. *The artifice, gross as it was, imposed on the whole Latin Church; the false decretals passed for true during* 800 *years*, and were scarcely given up in the last century. *It is true*," adds Fleury, "*that, in the present day, there is*

hardly any man moderately informed in these matters wh not recognise the forgery."[1]

575. "The decree of Gratian, (in 1551,)" he continues,[2] ceeded in confirming and extending the authority of the fa cretals which were found scattered everywhere; for, during than three centuries, no other canons were acknowledged those in this collection; no others were followed in the scho in the tribunals. Gratian had even gone beyond these decr extend the authority of the Roman Pontiff, maintaining *th Pope was not subject to the canons.* This he said of hi head, and without bringing any authoritative proof for it. in the Latin Church a confused idea was formed that the of the Pope was unlimited," &c.

"The forgery of the decretals, attributed to the first I says the learned Dupin, doctor of the Sorbonne, "is present day so well known that it is unnecessary to say a about it."[3]

And yet he adds, that "*they have been cited times u number by the Popes, the councils, and the canonists.* A appeared in a dark age, it is not astonishing that they w ceived without much hesitation. Yet Hincmar of Rheims a French bishops had, at first, much difficulty in receiving but soon after, they acquired authority, being supported l Court of Rome, the pretensions of which they favoured." speak the doctors of Rome.

576. At the view of these impostures, without the aid of the empire of the Papacy could never have been establish ask once more, if every one does not see, with profound ast ment, or, shall I not say, with devout admiration, that the propagators of these gigantic lies were able, nevertheless, to tain a fidelity so perfect in preserving intact, during eigh turies, the very books of which, at the same time, they inter

[1] Labbe, the Jesuit, has himself exposed the imposture. And yet, Finch, the Popes of the Church of Rome have hitherto never condem false decretals, (Romish Controv., vol. ii., p. 451. London, 1851.) They in the Breviary.

[2] Tom. iv., Fourth Discourse on Ecclesiastical History, § 6.

[3] Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Eccles, p. 215. Utrecht, 1731.

the reading in the vulgar tongue, under pain of death, to all the nations of the earth!

SECTION SECOND.

THE DONATION OF CONSTANTINE.

577. But what shall we say of *the donation of Constantine*, of his leprosy, his cure, and his baptism? This audacious imposture must be noticed here separately, on account of the great use the Popes made of it, the immense success they obtained with it, and all that is still to be found about it in the Roman *Breviary*. Constantine, we are told, had been attacked with a frightful leprosy all over his body; all the remedies applied were inefficacious; the priests of the capitol were consulted. "Let us kill a certain number of young children," they answered. "We will fill a bath with their blood, still warm; plunge into it, and you will be cured." Constantine, struck with horror, refused. The following night he saw in a dream the apostles Peter and Paul. "We are sent to thee by Jesus Christ," they said. "Thou wilt find the Bishop of Rome on Mount Soracte; he has retired into the caverns of the rocks with his priests, to avoid thy persecutions. Send for him; he will shew thee a bath. Plunge into it three times, and thou wilt be cured. But then purify thyself, forsake thy idols, and serve the true God." The emperor, alarmed, sought out Pope Sylvester. "Who are those gods that visited me last night?" he asked. "They are not gods, but apostles of Jesus Christ; and, better to convince thee, I will cause one of my deacons to bring *the images of the two apostles, which they keep for worship*" (!!) The emperor, struck with admiration, recognised them, obeyed the Divine call, was baptized by Sylvester, saw at once his leprosy entirely cured, and, under the influence of Sylvester, built several churches, and adorned them with holy images. Such is the gross tale of these impostures, which every priest of the Latin Church is still obliged to recite in his *Breviary* at every return of the 31st of December.[1] "*Constantinus igitur coelestibus monitis obtemperans Silvestrem diligentissimè con-*

[1] Breviarium Romanum, (on the feast of Pope Sylvester, December 31.) Lectio iv. et lectio v.

quisitum vocat; a quo apostolorum imagines recognoscens, tismo sanatur. Itaque auctore Silvestro, multas basilicas ac cavit, quas sacris imaginibus ornavit!"

But let us listen again to the Abbé Fleury. "Leo IX., says, "and the Popes who undertook to repair the ruins of tenth century, and to restore the splendour of the Roman Ch wished also to re-establish its temporal power, which they fou primarily on *the donation of Constantine.* Everybody in the sent day," he adds, "knows what this donation amounts to; its falsity is even more universally acknowledged than that of decretals of Isidore. But in the time of Gregory VII. and successors the truth of this story was not questioned; St Ber himself supposes it to be true; it was known and received i the ninth century; and men's minds scarcely began to be disab towards the middle of the fifteenth.[1] And if you go to Rom visit, as we have done, the holy church of the Lateran, 'the pri pal basilica in Rome and in the world,' look on your left, near left entrance on the north side of the church, at the great ma which Gregory XI. placed there in 1371, or, on the right of right entry, at that which Pius V. placed there two centu later, you will read on either the leprosy of Constantine, cure and baptism at Rome, although every one knows that was not baptized before 337, at Nicomedia, according to unanimous testimony of Eusebius, Ambrose, Socrates, Sozom and Theodoret." (See Muratori, *Annal. d'Italia,* Ann. 324.)

578. Once more, let every one judge of the danger, alm inevitable, to which the Scriptures were exposed in such d with such men, in such hands—those Scriptures which were bidden to the people at a later period, in the name of the Po under penalty of death. And yet the danger has been incu without the least injury, for more than ten centuries! To wh must the glory be ascribed but to the God of the Scriptures?

But again, what was all this compared with what has l

[1] It makes a part of the lying collection of Isidore the merchant, such a pretended council at Rome, under Sylvester, the letter of Athanasius to J that of Anastasius to the bishops of Germany, &c., &c. It is to be fou the Decree of Gratian. *Distinct.* xcvi. (See Basnage, *Annales ad Annum* § 7; and Gieseler, ii., § 20, note v.)

done to alter the works of the fathers, and even to alter them officially?

Certainly, it was here that, in two directions, the perils of the canon appeared to be imminent. On the one hand, false works of the fathers were fabricated in very great numbers, in the bosom of the Roman Church, and even quoted largely by her greatest doctors, to justify her pretensions and her doctrines. On the other hand, the genuine works of the fathers were altered and falsified in the bosom of the same Church, and often by superior orders, in her mysterious *Index Expurgatorius.*

SECTION THIRD.

FALSE BOOKS OF THE FATHERS FABRICATED OR QUOTED.

579. I say, *false books.* The world has been deluged with them. If you wish to form an idea of their number, and of the difficulty of separating them from the genuine works of the writers to whom they are ascribed, read, respecting only the writings of Chrysostom and Basil, what their editors, the learned Benedictine monks, tell us.[1] "The multitude of books which have *falsely* taken the name of Chrysostom (*ementiuntur*) is immense, (*ingens,*)" says Montfaucon. "The pains I have been obliged to take," says Garnier, "to distinguish the genuine works of Basil from the spurious, are enormous, (*vel maximum,*) since not a small number only, but *all* have been controverted, (*cum adducantur in controversiam non pauca quaedam scripta, sed omnia.*)" On this subject we refer our readers to the complaints of Thomas James, chief keeper of the Bodleian Library in Oxford University, contained in a very learned work, published first in 1612, and reprinted in London in 1843 with this title:— "A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome, for the Maintenance of Popery." In the first part the author treats *of the bastardy of the false fathers;* in the second, *of the corruption of the true fathers;* and in the last, (the fifth,) *of three*

[1] Joannis Chrysostomi omnia quae extant Opera, B. Bernardi de Montfaucon. Paris, 1839; Præfatio. S. Basilii, Caesareae Archiep., &c. Opera Juliani Garnier, Monachi Benedict.; Præfatio. Paris, 1721.

remedies against all manner of Popish corruptions, to rest genuine texts to the Church of God. In the first part h merates in detail 187 treatises charged with being spurious most distinguished doctors of the Church of Rome, such a larmin, Baronius, Possevin, Cotton, Coccius,[1] Pamelius; shews, moreover, in very exact and particular tables, t uphold the teachings of Rome, these very men have themselves to make use of these spurious writings in thei troversial works.

In a list of 103 of these doctrines, he enumerates, upo of them, those of these 187 spurious books which each principal catholic doctors have respectively alleged, and th passages in their works in which these citations are made.[2]

We are not able, it is evident, to present these details; it require volumes. We shall content ourselves with some exa and cite only the Catholic authorities.

580. For example, in order to exalt Mary by a gros chronism, and to make all the Catholic priests believe, reciting their *Breviary*, that, as early as the fourth cent Augustin called the Virgin Mary *the only hope of sinners*, found convenient, even in the Roman *Breviary*, (for Decem to cite a spurious sermon by this father, in which he is m say, "Through thee we hope for the pardon of our transgr because thou art *the only hope* of sinners, (*per te speramus delictorum, quia tu es* spes unica peccatorum.)" But the dictine monks, in editing this father, do not hesitate to s this passage, "though it is read in the *Breviary* under th of Augustin, is not his;[4] that it is unworthy even of Jer whom it has been sometimes attributed, and must belong t recent times, since it is the work of some unskilful forger *quippe est imperiti alicujus consarcinatoris.*)"

581. For example, again, to refer, out of these 187

[1] Jodocus.

[2] James's Treatise, Appendix, part i., pp. 339–342. Ed. London, 1843.

[3] Breviarium Romanorum, ex decr. S. Concilii Trident. restitutum, (An 1823.) Pars hiemalis, die ix., Decembris, Serm. Sanct. Augustini Episc.

[4] "Rejiciunt omnino ut falsum Verlinus et Vindingus. Nec injuriâ sanè in *Breviario* legatur sub Augustini nomine." The Benedictine fathers put say, for the first time, in their Appendix.

writings alleged by James, only to the forged passages of Augustin, (sixty-one in number,) and, among all these, only to those which have been made use of by Baronius and Bellarmin alone, the two most celebrated controversialists of Rome, both cardinals, both librarians of the Vatican, and both twice on the point of being popes.

His treatise *De Animâ et Spiritu*, acknowledged by the doctors of Louvain not to be genuine, (Lovan., tom. iii.,) is cited by Baronius, (tom. v., p. 537,) and by Bellarmin, (tom. ii., p. 536; tom. iii., p. 1731.)

His treatise *De Continentiâ*, acknowledged to be spurious by Erasmus, is cited by Bellarmin to prove that lust is not a sin, (tom. iv., pp. 383, 387; tom. vi., p. 1312.)

His *Sixteen Epistles to Boniface*, acknowledged to be spurious by Bellarmin, Erasmus, and the doctors of Louvain, are made use of by Baronius, (tom. v., pp. 477–479, 482, 485, 501.)

His *Epistle ad Laetum*, rejected as spurious by Erasmus, is cited by Bellarmin to prove that children may enter a convent without the consent of their parents.[1]

His *Liber Hypognosticon*, held by Bellarmin not to be his, as Possevin asserts, is made use of by Bellarmin himself, (tom. iv., p. 14.)

His book, *Ad Orosium*, declared by Bellarmin not to be his, is employed by Bellarmin himself to prove the authenticity of Ecclesiasticus, (tom. i., p. 52.)[2]

His book, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, censured by Bellarmin as not being his, but the work of a heretic,[3] is made use of by Baronius, (tom. i., p. 821,) as also by Cotton, to prove that Mary is the queen of heaven, (tom. i., p. 97.)

His *Sermo de Sanctis*, 35, held to be undoubtedly spurious by Baronius, is made use of by him, (tom. i., p. 415.)

His book *De Speculo*, which evidently "*neo pilum habet Augustini*," according to Erasmus and Possevin,[4] is cited by Bellarmin to prove that Tobit is canonical, (tom. i., p. 143.)

[1] Tom. ii., p. 584.

[2] "Nec librum illum esse Augustini ut eruditi fatentur," (Bellar., De Controv., tom. iii.; De Missa, lib. ii., cap. xii., p. 229.)

[3] Bell., Disp. de Controv., tom. iv.; De Gratia Primi Hominis, cap. iii., pag. 4; De Effect. Savram., tom. iii., lib. ii., c. x., p. 37. [4] Possevin, in Apparat., tom. i., p. 150.

His book, *De Utilitate Pœnitentiæ*, condemned both by the doctors of Louvain and by Erasmus as not his, is cited by Bellarmin to prove the sacrament of penance, (tom. iii., p. 1156.)

Lastly, his book, *De Urbis Excidio*, pronounced by Erasmus to be the work of an unknown author, is cited by Baronius, (tom. v., pp. 20, 200.)

But why need I give these details, when we have in our hands the Roman *Breviary*?

Section Fourth.

THE BREVIARY.

582. Here it is that we may see in abundance the easy, general, and persevering use made of spurious books in the Roman Church, when the object is to support her doctrines.

What, in fact, is there more official and more sacred than this book of devotion—indispensable all over the world for all the priests of Catholicism—reconstructed (300 years ago) by a decree of the Council of Trent,[1] and by a bull of Paul V., and reprinted from year to year by authority in the middle of the nineteenth century? Take it in your hand. What do you find there? Recitals most manifestly contrary to history, often acknowledged to be false by the most eminent doctors of the Papacy, and taken (at least for the saints of the first ages) either from the *Pontifical*, (Lives of the Popes,) or from the *Forged Decretals*, or from the *Roman Martyrology*. Read from one end to the other the legends of each day, and you will see that the new saints, canonised since the year 993,[2] are far from presenting legends less repulsive or less fantastic than the earlier ones. Read, for November 23, the fable of Pope Clement,—his anchor round his neck, his chapel, and the flowing back of the waters of the Euxine. Read, for April 26, the fable of Pope Marcellinus and the false Council of *Senuesse*, to establish the dogma that the Pope, or "the supreme see," is to be "judged by none." Read, for May 3, the fable of Pope Alexander, fabricated in order to give a divine origin (in the year 109) to the use of holy water, of which there

[1] Sess. xxv., c. 21.

[2] When the first canonisation was made, it is said, by John XV. for Uldaric.

had not been really a trace in the Church for the first five centuries. Read, for January 15, the spurious epistle of Marcellus, of which the Jesuit Labbe himself has acknowledged the fraud, and the intent of which is to demonstrate that the Church of Rome is "the head of the Churches," and that no lawful council can anywhere be held but by permission of the Roman Pontiff. Read, for December 31, the fable of Pope Sylvester, pretending that Bishop Hosius of Cordova was his legate at the Council of Nice. Read, for September 19, the legend of St Januarius, whose body, being carried to Naples, extinguished the flames of Vesuvius, and whose blood, from the time of Diocletian to our own days, liquifies when brought near his skull. Read, for October 9, the legend of Dionysius the Areopagite, convicted at Athens by Paul, then sent from Rome to Gaul by Pope Clement to preach the gospel, and beheaded at Paris, but walking from that city a distance of two miles, carrying his head in his hands! This legend is written in the *Breviary*, though, before the ninth century, it had never been mentioned by any one for 700 years.[1]

583. Let us check ourselves; for we might cite the legends of the whole book. Certainly, when we reflect that such has been for so many ages the constant and principal discipline in which the priests of Rome have been trained all over the world—when we consider that every day they have to mix with their devotions falsehoods so manifest—acknowledged as such even by their own doctors—we shall receive two strong impressions. On the one hand, we shall be no longer astonished to see such men welcome with eagerness, and by the same means, as being able to serve the same cause, all the most repulsive and absurd modern miracles, apparitions of the Virgin at Salette, or Lourdes, or elsewhere, images which sweat, or weep, or drop blood, saints who, like Liguori, during their prayers, remain suspended in the air, and who have been during their lifetime endowed with ubiquity, shewing themselves at the same time in different places.[1] But,

[1] The father Richard Simon wrote in 1685:—"The fables, from which the Breviary is not yet thoroughly purged, have never been approved by respectable members of our communion, (the Roman.) But if all of them were taken away, there would be scarcely any 'Lives of the Saints' left."—*Lettres Choisies*, tom. i., lettre xxvii. Amsterdam, 1770.

[2] See The Lives of St Alphonsus Liguori and Four other Saints, Canonised

on the other hand, how must we be struck with the profo admiration at the extreme hazard to which the collection Scriptures has been exposed, among such men, during 900 o years, and yet that this book has come forth unsullied fro hands! Honour, then, to their immutable canon! Hon their immaculate text of the New Testament!—that is honour and adoration to God who gave them, and who pr them, even in the midst of such men, because He gave them

584. We wish to close this argument, which has occupied too many pages; but, to comprehend the extent dangers the canon has escaped under the rule of Rome, proceedings relative to books, it is needful not only to not forged writings which have been accepted by her; we mu survey the genuine writings that have been officially falsi promote the interest of papal doctrines. It is then that y really be able to form a just idea of the protection by whi Scriptures must have been sheltered, in order to reach us i integrity.

Section Fifth.

THE GENUINE WORKS OF THE FATHERS FALSIFIED.

585. For brevity's sake we shall confine ourselves to re lating what the wise and conscientious James has said o subject, in his chapters entitled, the one, *Corruption of the Fathers;* the other, *The Mystery of the Indices Expurgat*

This author discusses with much precision, in the cou ninety-five pages, fifty alterations made in the fathers to p the Roman doctrines. He then demonstrates the fraud, from editions previously printed, or from the most ancient scripts. Let us adduce, for example, the first, which occ Cyprian.[1]

586. This father is naturally one of those whose works Ro taken the greatest pains to *expurgate,* (to use her own lang because he wrote in Latin; in addition to which he was a

May 26, 1839, a work published first in Rome by Cardinal Pastulatori, an wards in London, by Cardinal Wiseman. See the Life of Liguori, pp. of St François Girolano, p. 102; of St Jean-Joseph, p. 150.

[1] Treatise, &c., p. 75–104.

and a martyr. Cardinal Borromeo was specially intrusted by Pope Pius IV. with publishing a new edition, Manutius with printing it at Rome,[1] and four cardinals with taking care that the work was properly done. But in the first passage, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, cap. 4,[2] after these words—"*By this the other apostles were invested with the same honour and power as Peter; but the beginning sets out from unity, in order to shew one Church of Christ,*"—they have interpolated (in spite of eight or nine editions printed previously to 1564)[3] the following words:—"*And that one chair* (cathedra) *might be shewn, the primacy is given to Peter. And they are all pastors; but one flock is shewn us which all the apostles feed with unanimous consent.*"[4]

Then, to these words of Cyprian, printed at Rome—"*Does he who resists the Church believe himself to be in the Church?*"—the following words are added in the later edition printed at Anvers: "*He who forsakes the chair of Peter, on which the Church is founded, must not presume that he is in the Church,* (*Qui cathedram Petri, supra quam fundata est, deserit, in Ecclesiâ se esse non confidat.*)"

Now the editor, Pamelius himself, James says, attests that these changes have been made contrary to not only all the ancient printed editions of Cyprian, but contrary to all the ancient manuscripts, with the single exception of one that was found, according to him, in an old abbey near Haynau, in Silesia.[5]

587. St James shews, moreover, at some length, many other falsifications of the fathers: for example, in Cyprian again, *De Bono Patientiæ*, contrary to all manuscripts,[6] and elsewhere; in *Augustin*, in seven of his works; in *Ambrose*, in three of his

[1] The edition appeared at Rome in 1564.

[2] P. 253, 4th ed., Paris, 1574. "Hoc erant utique et caeteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut una Christi Ecclesia monstretur."

[3] That of Spires, 1477; that of Bâle, 1520, 1525, 1530; of Cologne, 1520; that of Erasmus, Remboldt, and Grypheus. Pamelius says he had them under his eyes in his revision of Cyprian.

[4] "Ut et cathedra una monstretur. Unam cathedram constituit. Et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis unanimi consentione pascatur."

[5] Abbatiae Cambronensis in Hannoniâ. Pamelius, (James, p. 147.)

[6] Treatise, &c., p. 151.

works; in *Chrysostom*, in four of his homilies; in the acts o
councils; in *Ignatius*, in *Cyril*, in *Jerome*, in *Gregory*, &c.

588. Among others, he instances the thirty-eighth [1] ep
Gregory, which the celebrated bishop Jewel, in one of his se
had adduced as announcing that *the King of Pride* (Antich
his coming would find to assist him *a whole army of priests*
their pride prepared for him, (*sacerdotum ei praeparatu*
citus.) The bishop was immediately assailed and defamed
University of Oxford for having altered the words of Gre
they stood in the printed editions. But, on referring
ancient manuscripts of this father in All Souls' College,
found that Jewel had quoted the true reading; while his ac
without being aware, had really patronised a falsified text;
the Roman editions had *expurgated* Gregory's text by v
"*Sacerdotum est praeparatus exitus*," thus making him
the contrary, that Antichrist would destroy the priests.

589. The same thing happened, though in a more not
manner, to the noble Du Plessis Mornay, in his famous disp
with Du Perron, and not long after, in the age of the Refor
to the learned reformer Peter Martyr, in his controversy
Gardiner. In order to combat transubstantiation, he had
a passage of Chrysostom, which he had read at Flore
a manuscript of his *Epistle ad Caesarium*, at that tin
published. "*The nature of the bread remains the same*,
Chrysostom. Now, after the martyrdom of Cranmer, a c
this passage of Chrysostom, in the handwriting of the ref
had been left in the archbishop's library, and the Roman c
versialists had declared that this passage *was only an imp*
fabrication of P. Martyr, (*Vermigli*.) But some time af
honest Frenchman, a Roman Catholic, *Emeric Bigot*, tra
in Italy, met in a monastery of the Dominicans at Florenc
this manuscript, of which Martyr (himself a Florentine) ha
merly taken a copy. He transcribed it and took it to Pari
delighted with the discovery he had made, caused it to be pr
printed in that city. But what happened immediately?
censors of the Sorbonne, who had been informed that the
would shortly appear, obtained an order from the king to s

[1] St Gregor, lib. iv., ep. 38. (Treatise, &c., p. 147.)

They required Bigot to take out of the work before it was published all this offensive portion of Chrysostom, extending to nine pages, to cancel the title and table of contents in which this epistle was named, and, that the loss might not be perceived, to take care to substitute nine new pages! Nevertheless, as the public were astonished at not seeing the expected epistle, and as some traces still remained of its abstraction, Wake recovered the cancelled pages, and Basnage published them. At last the Jesuits[1] were obliged to publish it themselves, and tried to shew that Chrysostom's words, as Martyr had read them, if properly understood, contained nothing contrary to the orthodox doctrine of Rome.[2]

590. It is thus, that in the publication of the fathers, the general policy of Rome has always been to subordinate the integrity of their text to the interests of her own dogmas; so that if you happen to discover some ancient manuscript of one of the most esteemed fathers, containing sentences that are not for her advantage, rather than they should be published, the original must be destroyed or corrected, and not printed without undergoing *expurgation*.

591. The corruption of the text of the fathers, James says again, would have gone much further, if, towards the beginning of the sixteenth century, an Erasmus of Rotterdam had not been found,—if this learned man had not given the first signal of alarm against the barbarous alteration which their books were undergoing, and if the little but noble city of Bâle had not laboured so admirably in the faithful reproduction of their best works.

Also the Roman expurgators, since the death of Erasmus,[3] have busied themselves in publishing new editions of his works, "with so many alterations, that a volume might be made of the passages they have retrenched or corrupted."[4]

[1] Father Hardouin.

[2] See the whole account detailed in the *Catholic Layman*, May 19, 1858. See also Buddaeus, *Theol. Dogmat.*, lib. v., v. 1, § 33; and Richard Simon, *Lettres Choises*, i., 115.

[3] In 1536, at the very time when it was in agitation to make him a cardinal. This learned man was allowed, during his lifetime, to publish his satires and denunciations against the abuses of the times and the impostures of the monks; but after his death the influence of his writings was very much dreaded.

[4] Treatise, &c., p. 318. There is a list, volume by volume, at the end of the

592. In a word, if you wish to form an idea, this author of the labour of alterations these expurgators have expend reproducing the documents of ecclesiastical history, compa last edition of the Councils published at Rome with the Co of *Binius*, the Councils of Binius with those of *Nicolinus*, of Nicolinus with those of *Sirius*, with *Zerlin*, or with C and you will always find that the last editions are the wor the same time, the worst are reckoned the best amon Romanists.

But of all these astounding facts, the most significant mysterious and powerful institution of the *Index Expurga* It is here that we may form an idea of the dangers the humanly speaking, has been exposed to in the Roman Chur is here we shall see nearer at hand the open or secret acts o lence done to the monuments of ecclesiastical history and fathers by the authorities of Rome, and by the Jesuits. In of all their bulls and bloody persecutions, the writings of Wi and Luther had deprived them of half Europe, and they fou would be necessary, for the preservation of their power, that first enterprises against books should be continued on a scale; and this gave birth to the bold institution of the *Ind* which it now remains for us to speak.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.

593. The origin of the *Index* must be attributed alike Jesuits, the Popes, and the Council of Trent.

The council, considering the dangers with which the Chu Rome would be menaced if all sorts of books had free circu urged the Pope to choose the best-qualified of his cardin order to constitute them *inquisitors-general* for the whole tian republic; so that all other inquisitors, established by th every city and province, might take council of them.

fourth part, entitled, "A Table of the Divinity Books first set forth and ap then censured, by Papists," (p. 269.) "The number of corrupted pla reckoning the corrections of the Spanish Index Expurgatorius, amount," says, "to 524, many of which contain from one hundred to two hundred l

They had, besides, deputies, commissaries, and notaries under them, charged to take care that nothing contrary to the Catholic faith should be written or published, and that heretics, of whatever rank, should be punished severely, by the loss of their dignities and property, and, if requisite, of their life. The council chose at first, from the multitude of bishops of which it was formed, the prelates of the greatest ability to draw up an *Index*, which marked all the books to be interdicted. Their work, after having been presented to the council, was submitted to Pope Pius IV., who at last ordered it to be published, with certain regulations, by a bull of March 24, 1564. After that Sixtus V. greatly enlarged both the rules and the expurgations; Pius V. and Gregory XIII. still further increased the privileges of the cardinal inquisitors; and, lastly, Clement VIII., again taking the *Index* in hand, named seven cardinals, and a good number of able men, to whom he gave "all the powers necessary," he said, "to accomplish in reference to books the triple business which had been committed to them, of *interdiction*, *expurgation*, and *publication*." Thus the bull[1] speaks of books to be *interdicted*, books to be *expurgated*, and books to be *printed* or *reprinted*. And this affair, in the eyes of the Papal Court, was one of great importance. It therefore took the greatest care in the choice of its inquisitors, and gave them enormous powers over all sorts of persons, and all sorts of writings. It even established all the apparatus of a printing establishment in the palace of the Vatican, in order that the reprinting of works might be carried on under the eyes of the cardinals.

594. "Was it known till of late," says the learned Mr James,[2] "(and that by God's especial providence,) that at Rome, at Lisbon, in Spain, Naples, and in the Low Countries, there were men appointed for the same purpose, and books printed, to the end that neither in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, Latin, nor in any other language, in divinity, humanity, law, physic, philosophy, or any faculty, there should be any proposition, position, book, sentence, word,

[1] "Quo facilius negotium, cum prohibitionis tum expurgationis et impressionis librorum, peragatur, eas omnes facultates privilegia et indulta confirmamus, et, quatenus opus est, innovamus," &c. See Lit. Clem. VIII., Praefixas Ind. Lib. Prohib. datas Tusculi sub annulo Piscatoris, 1595; Clem. VIII., in Ind. Lib. Prohib., p. 5.

[2] Treatise, &c., p. 236.

syllable, or letter, that would impugn the doctrine establis
the Court of Rome or the Council of Trent, uncorrected, unan
Nay, do they not proceed a little further? To correct
Greek or Latin, of the East or West Church? And this re
tion or expurgation of all manner of books, doth not onl
unto the printed volumes, but unto the manuscript copies
hath been already sufficiently proved elsewhere." "*Ad ista
quoque purgatio pertinet*," says the Jesuit Possevinus of Ma

595. Moreover, "if the Papists,," Mr James goes on to say
any good meaning in framing these catalogues of books pro
or purged, why do they make it *opus tenebrarum?* Why
hide them so cunningly from the light and sight of men, th
there be of their own religion that do know the mystery
artifice? The knowledge thereof is too high for them; it is n
for the inquisitors. These catalogues, when they are print
delivered only into their hands; no man can get one of th
he bachelor, licentiate, or doctor in divinity, unless he be
office, or fit to be trusted with such a secrecy. . . .
all these books are to be seen, with sundry others, b
together by God's special providence into the public lib
Oxford; printed, all of them, beyond the seas, by those tha
esteemed true Papists."[2] "The *Index* of Antwerp was dis
by Junius, who lighted upon it by great hap.[3] The Spani
Portuguese was never known till the taking of Cadiz.[4] The
Index was procured, but with much ado."

596. "We understand, it is true, that the partisans of th
of Rome pretend in the present day that the alteration of

[1] "The Index Expurgatorius of Rome was published by Jo. Maria, M
the Sacred Palace, Romae, 1607, in 8vo. The Portuguese Index by Georg. D
Archbishop of Lisbon, at Lisbon, 1581, in 4to. The Spanish, by Gaspar
Cardinal and Archbishop of Toledo, Madrid, 1584, in 4to. Also that of
by Gregorius Capuccinus; the title is Enchiridion Ecclesiasticum, Ven.,
8vo. That of the Low Countries, by commandment of the king of Spain
Duke of Alva, with the especial care and oversight of Arias Montanus,
Ant., 1571." (Treatise, &c., p. 236.)

[2] The Catalogue of the Public Library at Geneva mentions four of them
others, that of Spain, by Quiroga; that of Danvers, reprinted at Saumur
under the care of Du Plessis Mornay; and that of Rome, in 1686.

[3] James, Treatise, &c., p. 244.

[4] Does Mr James refer to the siege of 1553? Or, perhaps, he refers to th
of Cadiz by the English in 1576?

authors was not the object of the *Index Purgatorius*, and did not enter into the circle of its jurisdiction; but this is a vain excuse, and we have irrefragable proof of the contrary." First of all, the *Index* itself ordains very clearly that in such and such a father such a sentence shall be cancelled, (*deleatur;*) then the avowals of the expurgators, and the high approbation they award themselves for these alterations of the texts; lastly, *ipsum factum*, their own acts, the books of the fathers actually expurgated, especially those of Ambrose, of Cyprian, and of Gregory, (all printed at Rome.) What reply can be made, if, to prove that the fathers have been purged, we shew the *Index* that enjoins it, and enjoins it without any other reason than their disagreement with the doctrines of Rome? There exists, we know, two *Indices Expurgatorii*—one printed a long time ago at Madrid,[1] the other very recently at Rome, under the care of the Master of the Sacred Palace.[2] Now, in these two *Indices* you will find cancelled sentences of the text of Gregory of Nyssa, of Chrysostom, of Anastasius, of Eucherius, of Procopius, of Agapetus, of Didymus, of Alexander—sentences attacking the worship of images, penances, and the primacy of Peter, or asserting the supremacy of temporal princes. What reply can be made to this first proof, when, for example, for Gregory of Nyssa you read these words in the *Index* of Spain, that in this sentence, "We have learnt to render our worship *only* to that nature which is uncreated," the word *only* is struck out?[3] Take another example from Chrysostom. We read that, in his discourse on St Philogonius, these words are to be cancelled, "As for me, I assert that if any of us sinners, renouncing our former evil ways, sincerely promises God to return to them no more, God will require nothing more for fuller satisfaction."[4]

[1] Indices Libror. Expurgandorum, in Studiosorum gratiam confecti, tom. i., in quo quinquaginta auctorum libri prae caeteris desiderati emendatur Romæ, ex Typographia R. Cam., Apost., 1807. Superiorum permissa; in 8vo.

[2] Ser. Col., 116, circa finem, in illis verbis: "Eam solummodo naturam quae increata est, colere et venerari didicimus, deleatur dictio solommodo. Quod est ipsissimum verbum Greg. Nyssi."—*Ind. Hisp.*, p. 30.

[3] "Ego sane assero, quod si unusquisque de nobis peccantibus, relictis prioribus malis, Deo polliceatur vere se non rediturum ad ea, nihil aliud ad pleniorem satisfactionem Deus requisiturus sit. Quae verba sumptae sunt ex S. Chrys. Orati. de S. Philogonio."—*Ind. Hisp.*, p. 20.

[4] Apud Alph. Gomezeum, regium Typographum, 1584, in 4to.

597. But, after all, what need have we of the *Index* to the mutilation, when we hear the defenders of Rome and quisitors avow the duty of correcting the fathers; and w fact, they have so largely accomplished their expurgations?

Cardinal Boromeo and Cardinal Montalto, as well as the of Venusia, charged with editing the works of Gregory of all three openly avow having purged Cyprian, Ambrose, ar gory of all the spots impressed on them by the heretics, to the minds of the simple.[1] They have even interdicted s the works of the fathers, (particularly of St Ambrose,) ti labour of correcting was finished—"for fear," they said, in the editions previously printed, what was given for life operate for death."[2]

Section Seventh.

CONCLUSION OF THIS CHAPTER.

598. This is sufficient. It was necessary to pass all the under a rapid review, that the force of our present ar might be understood; that we might exhibit, on the one ha extreme danger which, without the grace of God, the vol the New Testament would have incurred from the incessant of Rome; and, on the other, the vigilant hand from on high has never ceased to protect the sacred deposit of the or God.

It would have been unfaithfulness on our part not to r these facts; for every one who considers them attentively

[1] "Totus in eam curam incubueris," Boromeo writes, "ut omnia Cypria mendis antea defermata, nunc in veterem illam integritatem ac speci tuerentur.—*Manutius in Ep.* "Obscura explicuimus," Montalto writes to XIII., "manca supplevimus, adjecta rejecimus, transposita reposuimus, emendavimus; omnia demum, ut germanam Ambrosii phrasim redolere positititiis quibuscunque abscisis, pro viribus, studuimus.—*Ep. Fclic. Montalto ad Greg. P. XIII.* "Praeclara haec Patrum monumenta," th of Venusia also wrote, "cum adeo corrupta depromerentur, ut interdum interdum ineptam, aliquando falsam, nonnunquam a fidei institutis, et ab auctorum menti aliquam, efficerent sententiam." (See also his letter at of the works of Gregory and Cyprian.)

[2] "Inquisitores S. fidei negotiis praefecti, lectionem illarum (ne quae data erant, operarentur mortem) nec omnibus nec absque delectu permi —*Ep. Card. Montalti*, tom. i. *Operum Ambrosii*

seized with devout astonishment at their Divine contrast. The spectacle of all these priests, prelates, inquisitors, and pontiffs, giving to the world with one hand these legends, their novel dogmas, their forged books, their *Breviaries*, their *Index Expurgatorius*; and with the other, as if in spite of themselves, preserving the pure canon of our twenty-seven scriptures in their unalterable integrity!

Let any one say, then, whether such innocence, maintained for ages on this single point, does not reveal a superhuman hand—always active, and always powerful in protecting the Sacred Volume?

Exceptional and involuntary innocence! Innocence inexplicable apart from that invisible hand! Innocence of twelve centuries! You testify silently, but gloriously, to the divinity of our Scriptures! Innocence altogether like that of the Prophet of Pethor, who never, in spite of all the longings of his heart, could curse Israel! Innocence of all those prelates and pontiffs, you confirm, you gladden afresh our faith—you render it glorious; for you, even you, exclaim, as from the summits of Pisgah, "Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel." "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent. He hath said it, and shall he not do it? hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" "According to this time, it shall be said, What hath God wrought?" "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel!"[1]

599. Thus, then, the Holy Word of God, like amianthus, which comes white and pure out of the crucible because it is amianthus—the Holy Word of God, though held as dangerous by all the Popes to our own day,[2] and though interdicted by them not long ago, under pain of death,[3] yet it alone, of all books, comes out entire from the furnaces of Rome, because it alone is the Word of God, inspired from on high, and abides for ever! I pass on to the eighth mark.

[1] Numbers xxiii. 19–23; xxiv. 5. [2] See the Encyclical Letter of Pius IX.
[3] Ever since 1229. See Propp. 560 to 663.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DECISIVE ADOPTION OF THE SECOND CANON CONTRARY NATURAL INCLINATION OF MEN'S MINDS.

600. *Fact the Eighth.*—The hand of God here reveals itself another mark not less evidently providential. We behold it long and mysterious work in the conscience of the Church, by of which the second canon was at last settled. Then you mig heard, after two centuries and a-half of hesitation, all the cl throughout the world which, since the days of the apostles, ceived the twenty books of the first canon, at last agree where to adopt with the same unanimity the five sma epistles. And we may, besides, remark, at the same time, astonishing agreement, a new feature, well suited to att Divine intervention—namely, that this universal and adoption of the second canon was contrary to the natural i tion of men's minds in all the contemporary churches. Fo was then, on the one hand, a most decided opposition b their prejudices and the books they adopted; while, on the there were numberless affinities between these very prejudi the writings they rejected—writings which henceforward w for ever out of the canon.

601. Duly to appreciate this novel proof, we must look phenomenon more closely. Without having been familia very long time with the writers of the primitive Church, v easily ascertain what influences had the strongest hold on minds during the second and third centuries, and the beg of the fourth, and, consequently, we are able to point out, all the writings claiming their religious regard, what thos

be, according to all probability, which, before the event, we should believe would be the objects of their choice. Now, what tendencies do you find prevalent at this epoch? An excessive fondness for the marvellous—stories without end of useless miracles—a predominant disposition to seek for allegories, to spiritualise texts and facts, without either measure or taste—most exaggerated notions of the sanctity of saints, and very false notions of their merits—an increasing tendency to exalt the priesthood, bishops especially—an admiration, almost idolatrous, of martyrs—an excessive confidence in the virtue of the sacraments, and particularly of baptism, as if it conferred salvation by the simple act of the priest—a violent reaction against the doctrine of the millennium and the personal reign of Jesus Christ—an antipathy to the Jews, and a constant disposition to apply the glorious promises which relate to Israel only to the Gentiles, by forced spiritualisations—the representation of departed believers as if they were already in glory—fantastic imaginations regarding the blessed Virgin, her miracles, her present dignity, and her future glory—prayers addressed, not yet undoubtedly to the dead to intercede with God, but to God to save the dead—extreme respect for celibacy—commendation of conventual or solitary life—of expiatory mortifications—of will-worship, (*ἐθελοθρησκεία*)—and of all those observances of human invention which have, as the apostle says, "a show of wisdom," (Col. ii. 23,) but which can only lead souls astray.

602. Now, of all these false notions there is not one word in the five epistles which at last were then universally acknowledged as canonical; but there is an abundance of these same notions in almost all the ecclesiastical books which were at the same period rejected for ever from the canon by all the churches of Christendom. Yet was there not reason, humanly speaking, to have expected quite the contrary? Was there not reason to believe that the five epistles, all of them so little favourable to these errors, would be so much the more rejected exactly at this epoch, because these errors had obtained great credit among the already corrupted churches of the East and the West? Was there not reason for imagining that ecclesiastical books would be seen to grow in favour in proportion as the false notions they recommended

grew also in favour in the Church? And yet, this is exa the reverse of all that has actually happened!

603. In the five epistles there is no legend, no puerility, no word about the virtues of the Virgin Mary, about her miracles, even her person. We find nothing about salvation obtained baptism, (which, indeed, is not once named;) nothing about privileges of the bishops; nothing about the least priority of to another, unless, perhaps, that which Diotrephus aimed for which he is so severely condemned by the apostle Joh nothing either to exalt angels. And even, to speak at the sa time of the second-first canon, while there had been so mu opposition in the East to the doctrine of the millennium taught the *Apocalypse*, and in the West, to the doctrine of the Novatia which was erroneously believed to be favoured by the *Epistle to Hebrews;* yet exactly at this epoch there was a readiness amo all the churches everywhere to receive this epistle and the *Apo lypse*, as making a part of the sacred oracles.

604. It was thus, then, that, under the providence of God, canon was consolidated, in spite of the prejudices and tendenc of the contemporaneous Church; and it was thus, also, that uninspired books were everywhere set aside, in spite of all th conformity to the false notions which were beginning to spr more and more among almost all the churches of Christendom.

605. And let it be well observed that, towards the commen ment of the fourth century, at the epoch when the final effort made in the Church to complete the canon, an important circu stance aggravated the danger, if she had not been protected, of troducing uninspired books with the five still controverted epist Only for a short time past the dangerous custom had beg of reading in some public services certain apocryphal books of Old Testament; and something of the same kind also was d for some of the ecclesiastical books which formed an appendage the New Testament, as the Apocrypha had been to the Old.

Jerome states,[1] that it was only from the fourth century t these books began to be read in churches; "not," he says, "to es blish doctrines, but only for edification." And Augustin tells u

[1] Praef. in Libr. Solomon. Opp., tom. i., pp. 938, 939.
[2] De Prædest. Sanctor., lib. i., cap. xiv. Cosin, History of the Canon, p. 10

that they (particularly Judith, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus,) were read to catechumens; but by inferior officers, and from a seat less elevated than that from which the priests and bishops read the canonical Scriptures. And Jerome informs us, about the epistle attributed to Barnabas, "that it was read in some churches with the apocryphal scriptures;"[1] and he says the same of the epistle of Clement.[2]

Here, let us say, was the danger. For if it resulted from this abuse, in reference to the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, that their very heresies caused them to be received at a later period by the Latin Church as canonical, (particularly for what they contain in favour of prayers for the dead, of justification, not by faith, but by works, and of the perfection attainable in the present life, &c.,) is it not very remarkable, when we compare the analogous errors with the wise moderation which the five epistles are able to maintain on these very points—is it not very wonderful that these errors have not had the same effect as to the Apocrypha of the New Testament, and that they have not been added, rather than the five controverted epistles, when the decisive acceptance of the *antilegomena* was accomplished?

Why, for example, when a separation was made between the different books, were the five epistles assigned plainly, universally, and decisively to the canon, while all the rest have been either rejected among the spurious (*νόθους*) books, such as *the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas,* and *the Epistle of Barnabas,*[3] or left among the uninspired books, (*οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους,*) as the epistles of Clement, of Ignatius, and of Polycarp?

606. Why, to begin with the most authentic and the most esteemed of the monuments of Christian antiquity, has not the Epistle of Clement of Rome been inserted in the canon, since its author was bishop of Rome, and a companion of Paul;[4] and Irenaeus[5] terms it "a most powerful epistle," (*ἱκανωτάτην γραφὴν*;) Eusebius, "great and wonderful," (*μεγάλη τε καὶ θαν-*

[1] Catal. Script. Eccles., c. vi. "Inter scripturas apocryphas legitur."
[2] Ibid., c. xv. [3] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., iii., 23.
[4] Philippians iv. 3.
[5] Haeres., iii., 3; ed. Harvey, ii., 10; "Potentissimas literas." (Latin version.) "Einen sehr grundlichen Brief," Stroth.

μασία ;) and says that, as Jerome asserts, it was read in churches ?[1]

In the midst of its real excellences, it had, nevertheless, i favour many of those marks of error which the fathers cite pleasure, and which might seem to make it more welcome t churches of the fourth centuries than the Scriptures of the s canon ; for example, his fable of the *phœnix*, (chap. xxv. which the fathers are fond of alluding as a proof of the r rection ;[2] or his assertion, also often cited,[3] "that the is *impassable* (ἀπέραντος) by men, but that there are other w beyond it," (chap. xx. ;) or, again, "that the saints have al entered into *the place of glory that is their due.*" (chap v.)[4]

607. Why, also, has not the Epistle of Barnabas been insert the canon ? For, though manifestly spurious, as the most em critics of our day are convinced, (Hug, Ullman, Neander, My Winer, and Hefele,)[5] yet, bearing the name of an apostle and phet, it is cited seven times by Clement of Alexandria, (w indeed the first to mention it ;) it is cited twice by Origen, calls it καθολικήν : it is cited by Eusebius, who ranks it some among the *spurious* (νόθους) books, sometimes among the *co verted*, (ἀντιλεγομένους :) it is cited by Jerome, who attests, have said, that it was read with the Apocrypha. But yet— should have above all recommended it to the human tendenc the doctors of the third and fourth centuries—it abounds in f allegories, rhetorical exaggerations, unsuitable types, ign accusations against the Jewish rites and the economy of the Testament, (chaps. vii., viii.) In all these respects it was cert far more in accordance with the spirit and taste of the age the five epistles of the second canon.

608. Why, again, have not the epistles of Ignatius, the hea St John, the successor of Peter at Antioch, the θεοφόρος, be

[1] Hist. Eccl., iii., 16.

[2] Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. xviii., cap. 8 ; Tertullian, De Resurr., cap.

[3] Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, v., 12 ; Origen on Ezekiel, ch. 18 ; De cipiis, ii., cap. 6, § 6; Jerome, in Epist. ad Ephes., ii., 2.

[4] Whereas no part of Scripture places God's elect in glory before the ret Jesus Christ and the great day of the resurrection.

[5] See Das Sendschreiben des Ap. Barnabas, 1840, pp. 147 to 195 ; and P Apost. Opera, Hefele, Proleg., p. 11. Tubingen, 1847.

scribed in the canon, at least the three of which the ancient Syriac version was discovered by Dr Cureton in 1845? for they are cited in the second century even by Polycarp[1] and by Irenaeus.[2] Ignatius underwent his glorious death only three or four years after the disciple whom Jesus loved; and many traits in his letter, particularly his longing for martyrdom, and his extravagant opinions on the episcopate, (if at least they existed in the copies of that age,) would render them much more acceptable to men of the fourth century than the five controverted epistles.

609. Why, lastly, should not the book of Hermas, who is supposed to be the friend mentioned by St Paul in Rom. xvi. 14, be admitted?—the book which the early fathers, Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, cite so often, calling it the *scripture*,[3] and of which Origen goes so far as to say that he holds it to be very useful, and inspired.[4] Its doctrine of an election founded on the prevision of our works,—his notions respecting the native powers of man, on the Fall, and on repentance, which he seems only to apply to chastity in marriage,[5] and to those who have fallen once after baptism,—all these Pelagian tendencies must have gained him favour in the third and fourth century, especially in the East, where, Jerome[6] tells us, he was in great repute, while almost unknown among the Latins.

610. Let us here hail the hand of God, which shews itself through the cloud. Certainly this mysterious operation of the decisive completion of the canon in all the churches of Christendom could not have been effected by the mind of man alone, since, as we have seen, it proceeded in a direction contrary to his feelings, contrary to his errors and the tendencies of the age; and since we have seen everywhere the choice of the Church pronounced without noise, constraint, or dispute, in a uniform manner, as under the control of an invisible Power, between the

[1] Chaps. vii. and viii.

[2] Adv. Hæres., v., 26; Eusebius. Hist. Eccl., iii., 36.

[3] Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., iv., 34.

[4] In Ep. ad Rom. xvi. 14. Yet elsewhere he says, (Homil. xxv., in Lucam ix. 58,) "Si tamen alicui placet hujusmodi Scripturam recipere."

[5] Lib. ii., caps. 1–4.

[6] Catalog., cap. x. The manuscript discovered by Tischendorf in one of the convents of Cairo contains, at the end of the New Testament, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas.

canonical books and those which were not such. Everywher received with firmness as divine, books unfavourable to hu inclinations, and everywhere rejected as uninspired those w flattered them most,—those which contained the germ of here towards which the Church itself was soon strongly attracted f day to day. Whence, then, came this choice, everywhere with constraint, without conceit, and yet without exception? Wh this secret impulse, contrary to the natural impulses of manki Whence this counteracting principle? The testimonies of times appeared to them, no doubt, powerful and decisive; there must necessarily have been also a divine agency to b about a result so general and so decisive,—to attach for eve the canon the five scriptures which man had so long hesitated receive, and to reject for ever uninspired books which had incautiously been admitted in different places to the public *a* *nosis*. How will you explain all this, without admitting operation of the Almighty Spirit? How otherwise will explain the repression, as to this one fact, of that spirit of e which had already insinuated itself into almost all the churc and which was about soon to commit such ravages among decaying churches both in the East and the West?

Let this eighth fact, then, lead us to acknowledge that canon came from God, and that it is indeed He who guards it

CHAPTER X.

THE WONDERFUL PRESERVATION OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT.

611. *Fact the Ninth.*—Another testimony to that Divine agency, which for eighteen centuries has guarded the scriptures of the New Testament, is the inexplicable preservation of their text.

This fact, so remarkable and so striking, has been profoundly studied, and duly established by the Herculean labours to which sacred criticism has devoted itself for two hundred years. When this new science began its work first of all among the English, in the preparation of Walton's Polyglott in 1657, of Fell's Greek Testament in 1675, above all, of Mill's Greek Testament in 1707, followed by the task announced by Bentley, (1716,) of examining all the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament concealed in the libraries of Europe, in order to compare them with one another, and publish the variations,—the world at first thought that this immense undertaking menaced danger to the faith, that it would lead to unsettle it greatly, and even shake its foundations. The Germans followed the English in these extensive researches, and have since gone beyond them.[1] We know that Griesbach alone, in 1786, had collated 335 Greek manuscripts for the Gospels alone; and, fifty years later, Scholz 674, besides 200 for the Acts, 256 for Paul's fourteen epistles, 93 for the Apocalypse, and others besides for the Catholic epistles.

[1] The noble labours of Bengel, Wetstein, (of Bâle,) Griesbach, Scholz, Matthaei, Tittmann, Lachmann, and Tischendorf are well known; as well as the recent labours of the excellent and learned Dr Tregelles, (see his Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, London, 1854.) In the Prolegomena of his seventh edition of the New Testament, (1858,) Tischendorf has reprinted the *Plan* of Bentley's projected researches.

We have elsewhere [1] treated at length of this interesting su
"When we recollect," we have said, "that the Greek New
ment has been copied and recopied in all Christian countrie
under the most different circumstances, during the course of
teen hundred years; that it has passed through three centur
pagan persecutions, when men convicted of having it in thei
session were thrown to wild beasts; then, that during the se
third, and fourth centuries, lying books were fabricated; that i
eighth and ninth, false legends and false acts were multiplied;
in the tenth and eleventh, so few persons knew how to read,
among princes; that in the twelfth and thirteenth, when the
the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue was punished with death
when, to propagate the error, the works of the fathers, and
the acts of the councils were wilfully mutilated;—when w
collect that scholars, not content with the public and pr
libraries of the West, have ransacked the convents of Mount A
of Turkish Asia, and of Egypt,—then we can conceive that a
beginning of these researches, the enemies of the Sacred
might believe that by this means irreparable injuries wou
inflicted upon it, and that a great number, even of its fri
might suffer distressing anxiety respecting the integrity of
Scriptures." But what has been the result?

612. On the contrary, by these gigantic labours, on whi
many distinguished men have expended their lives, a novel, sple
and unexpected proof has been given to the world of that P
dence which has watched for a succession of ages over the or
of God. The text has been found purer and better attested
the most devout Christians dared to hope. From this mass of
thirteen to fifteen hundred Greek manuscripts, sought out fro
the libraries of Europe and Asia, carefully compared with on
other, word by word, letter by letter, by modern criticism,
compared, too, with all the ancient versions, Latin, Arme
Syriac, Sahidic, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Sclavonian, Gothic,
Persian, and with all the quotations made from the New Testa
by the ancient fathers in their innumerable writings,—from
mass let us say, and from these gigantic labours, our adversa
astonished and confounded, have beheld sacred criticism re

[1] *Theopneustia*, chap. iv., sect. 3, pp. 164-197. (Scott's translation.)

covered with the dust of a thousand libraries, but unable, after all, to present the world with more than a paltry and inappreciable result,—paltry we will say with them, but *invaluable* by its nothingness we will say with the friends of the Sacred Word, and all-powerful by its insignificance.

In fact, all the hopes of the enemies of religion in this direction have been confounded, and, as Michaëlis has said, "They have ceased henceforth to hope for anything from those critical researches, which at first they had so strongly recommended." [1]

And so well established is the preservation of our Scriptures from this time forward, that at this hour, over all the world, you will see all the sects of Christians, even the most opposite, give us the same Greek Testament, without the various readings having been able to form among them two distinct schools. In fact, all Jesuits, ministers, or popes, cardinals, pastors, or archemandrites, at Rome or at Geneva, at Moscow or at Cambridge or Berlin, all collate the same manuscripts, cite the same editions, and produce the same texts, Griesbach, or Scholz, or Lachmann, or Tregelles, or Tischendorf.

613. We have taken care in another work to construct tables that will give every reader the means of readily apprehending these results of sacred criticism. This is one of the subjects that require to be presented to the eye in order to be clearly understood. We shall not go over it again.

We have there shewn as an example, for the Epistle to the Romans, (the longest and most important of the New Testament,) all the corrections Griesbach has found that are capable of making the slightest change in the meaning of any phrase, and are susceptible of being expressed in a translation. And how many do you think he has been able to find in the four hundred and thirty-three verses of this Scripture after a collation of about one hundred and forty manuscripts? He has found *five* small and insignificant ones, which yet, according to more modern critics, (Tittmann and Lachmann,) are reducible to *two*, or, according to Scholz, more modern still, to *three*. The first (vii. 6) depends only on the difference of a letter, (an *o* instead of an *e*.) Instead of reading "*that being dead in which we were held*," Griesbach reads, "*being*

[1] Vol. ii., p. 266. See also pp. 467–479.

dead to that in which we were held." The second (chap. withdraws as superabundant the parallel and reverse part 6; and the third (xvi. 5) reads, "*the first-fruits of Asia,*" of "*the first-fruits of Achaia.*"[1]

We have taken for another example the Epistle to the G and shewn that in the 149 verses of which it consists, G has found only the three following corrections, which, n affect the sense only in the slightest degree. "*They wis clude us,*" reads with Griesbach, "*They wish to exclude yo* "*which is the mother of us all,*" (iv. 26,) read, "*which is th of us.*" In ch. v. 19, for "*adultery, fornication, uncle* read, "*fornication, uncleanness.*"

Would you wish to know, as another example, the cor in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which contains 303 verse following are those which Griesbach[2] has been able to dis nine uncial manuscripts, 121 cursive manuscripts, eleven Scl manuscripts, of which Dobrowski gave him the readings, an others, the greater part in the library at Moscow, and m of by Matthaei in 1776. In the quotation Paul mak Psalm viii., in chap. ii. 7, Griesbach omits the words "*Th set him over the works of Thy hands.*" Chap. vi. 10—for *of love which ye have shewed,*" he reads, "*the love which y shewed.*" Chap. viii. 11, for "*his neighbour,*" he reads, h *low-citizen.*" Chap. x. 9—for "*to do, O God, thy will,*" h "*to do thy will.*" Chap. x. 31—for "*ye had compassion o my bonds,*" he reads, "*ye had compassion on those in* Chap. xi. 11—for *she "received strength to conceive seed, a delivered of a child when she was past age,*" he reads, "

[1] Dr Tregelles, on his recent visit to Rome, ascertained the reading in in the Vatican manuscript to be ἔχωμεν, instead of ἔχομεν. Instead of peace with God," it reads, "let us have peace with God." Mill had alread out this reading, and Tregelles confirms his testimony.

[2] We have preferred giving these readings after Griesbach to render t fact more significant, as he is considered by the latest critics to have acce readings too easily; this, however, is not the opinion of Tischendorf.

In addition, a just idea of the effect of the various readings on the sen text may be formed by consulting the interesting translation which M. R made of the precious manuscript of the Vatican. To the version of thi copy, M. Rilliet has added those of the various readings furnished by t Vulgate, and by the Greek manuscripts as late as the tenth century.

ceived strength to conceive seed when she was past age." Chap. xi. 13—for "*having seen them afar off, were persuaded of them, and embraced,*" he reads, "*having seen them afar off and embraced them.*" Chap. xii. 26—for "*shall be stoned or thrust through with a dart,*" he reads, "*shall be stoned.*" Chap. xiii. 9—for "*be not carried hither and thither,*" he reads, "*be not carried.*"

In a word, as we have said, of the 7959 verses of the New Testament, there are hardly ten or a dozen in which all the corrections occasioned by the new readings of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and many others, in consequence of their immense researches, are of any weight; and even eight of these twelve corrections consist only in the difference of a single word, and sometimes even of a single letter. We have enumerated them elsewhere, and shall not go over them again.

614. Such, then, has been the astonishing preservation of the sacred text through so many ages—such is the testimony of the manuscripts; and it is thus that the science which has collected them has exhibited to our view a magnificent monument of the ever-active Providence which watches over the Scriptures, and which has resolved to preserve with the same sovereignty the oracles of the New Testament, as it has guarded those of the Old.

615. What, then, do we infer from all this as to the Sacred Volume?

Our inference is, if it is fully demonstrated that the God of the Scriptures has watched over the text of the book, it is impossible to doubt that He has watched over its canon; for, assuredly, if there is a Providence to guard the words, there must also be a Providence to guard the books.

Such is our ninth fact: we now proceed to the tenth.

CHAPTER XI

THE STRIKING CONTRAST BETWEEN THE ERRORS OF ROME RE ING THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND ITS FIDELITY REGARDIN NEW.

616. *Fact the Tenth.*—Another historical feature will agai liantly illustrate that secret action of Providence, and she that if, to guard the Scriptures, it has watched over the J people for 3300 years, it has equally kept in obedience, o point, the most corrupt Churches for these eighteen centurie

This tenth fact, can it be believed, is the Apocrypha, an errors of Rome regarding it. We must explain our meaning

The guardianship of the Old Testament has not been intr to it, but only that of the New, as it has to all the other Chu in the world; God having pledged Himself, as we have sa take care from age to age, on the one hand, that the people o Jews even in their worst days, and on the other, that the Chu of Christendom, even the most corrupt, shall remain faithf their trust. The oracles of God *have been intrusted to them.*

But the historical fact we wish to point out here is the str contrast between the errors of Rome regarding the Old Testa and her immovable fidelity regarding the canon of the New.

Has sufficient attention been paid to this surprising fact? has it happened that neither the fathers of the Council of T nor others after them have ever done, or wished to do, for the Testament what they have effected so easily and so completel the Old? Humanly speaking, it would have been much mor their advantage in their controversies with us to have muti the volume of the New Testament. Moreover, the underta would have been at once more plausible, more easy, and

defensible. How comes it to pass that they have never done it? Who has deprived them of the power, and who of the will?

617. We recollect the astonishing facility with which the attempt of April 8, 1546, was effected, and the still more astonishing servility employed to sanction it, at least by silence, in the whole body of the Latin churches. When Paul III. had sent his three legates to Trent, in March 1545, to open a council, designed, it was thought, to reform the oecumenical Church in its chiefs and its members, they found, as we have said elsewhere,[1] only the bishop of the place and, a few days after, three Italian bishops. Two months more passed away before they were recruited by twenty other prelates; so that, ashamed of opening a general council with twenty-seven persons, they besought the Pope to adjourn it for eight months. But in December, their number being increased by twenty-six ecclesiastics, they ventured at last to open the assembly with three legates, three abbots, four generals of religious orders, and four archbishops, two of whom, however, were pensioners of the Pope, having been sent to Trent only to make a majority in favour of the legates, being only titular bishops.

The three first sessions were devoted solely to preliminaries; but with the fourth, on the 8th of April, the anathemas commenced; and it was then that, in the name of the universal Church, eleven uninspired books, which the whole ancient Church had rejected from the collection of inspired books, though recommending the reading of them, were declared to be infallible, and put on a level with Moses and the Prophets.

These eleven books, or parts of books, composed after the spirit of prophecy had ceased in Israel, rejected by all the Jewish nation, rejected by Jesus Christ and His apostles, rejected by the ancient fathers, and still rejected by the great so-called orthodox Church of the East, as they were fourteen hundred years before by St Jerome himself—that Jerome who is the oracle of the Latins for the Scriptures, and the author of their Vulgate Bible; and while we have seen, in 451, the general Council of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops, reject the Apocrypha,[2]—we see

[1] Prop. 69. See also Fra Paoli Sarpi Hist. de Concile de Trente, liv. ii., § 6, 1736, tom. 1., p. 180, and following.

[2] Confirming the Council of Laodicea.

the Council of Trent, which counted only fifty, declare them I
fifteen centuries later!

If, then, this enormous alteration in the oracles of God l
leaders of the Church of Rome appears to have succeeded w
little effort and so much promptitude, do we not see tl
would have been easy for them, humanly speaking, to have
jected the New Testament to the same outrage as the Old, if
had not checked their thoughts and held back their hands?

And what renders the contrast more wonderful is, that
facility for committing the outrage was great, the temp
seemed much greater.

618. We know that the principal reasons which impelle
fathers of the council to this attempt were their difficulti
their controversies with us.

When, to defend purgatory, the merit of works, prayers
dead for the living, and of the living for the dead, by passa
Scripture, they could find only texts from Baruch,[1] the Macca
Tobit,[3] or Ecclesiasticus,[4] it had always been very embarrassin
painful for them that it could be replied, "But in favour of
new doctrines you have only uninspired (human) books." It
therefore, free them from a very great difficulty, to be able t
an oecumenical decree which "transubstantiated, without alte
of the species," the eleven apocryphal books into inspired one
which invisibly changed all these writings, hitherto human
infallible Scriptures.

619. But let us here remark how much greater must have
the temptation in reference to the New Testament for Ro
have taken away one of its writings, or to have added some
For example, what can be more opposed to the prima
Rome, or to the doctrine of the mass, than the Epistle of St
to the Hebrews? Do we not recollect what trouble it gave
great Bossuet, to what adroitness of language his admirable
had recourse, either in his *Explanation of the Apocalyp*
elude what St John tells us of Rome under the name of Bal

[1] Chap. iii. 4, (according to the Vulgate.) See O. B. Fritzsche Handb
den Apokryphen der A. T., i., 188, Leipz., 1851.
[2] 2 Maccabees xii. 42. [3] Tobit xii. 11, 12.
[4] Ecclesiasticus i. 13, 19; iii. 3.

or in his *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*, to escape the overpowering declarations of the Epistle to the Hebrews against an unbloody expiation, or a sacrifice of Christ many times offered, or many times repeated? What an advantage would it have been to the Romanist doctors to get rid of these two books of Scripture? They might have justified the exclusion of one of them by the long hesitation of the Western churches before the fixation of the canon, and, above all, by the long differences of Rome on this subject;[1] while, on the other hand, they might have justified the exclusion of the Apocalypse by its style, its obscurities, and especially by the long opposition made to it in the East by the adversaries of the millennium?

620. But further, besides the thought of curtailing the canon, what a strong temptation existed to make additions to it.

To add, for example, some books favourable to the worship of Mary—another on the power of the bishops—another on the merit of works—another on the primacy of Peter. To add even the excellent Epistle of Clement, the first bishop of Rome. To add the *Apostolic Canons*, which Eusebius and Jerome appear to have attributed to the same father;[2] or his pretended *Recognitions*, called also *The Acts of Peter*, or some apocryphal Gospel favourable to the worshippers of the Virgin Mary; or, again, the Epistle of Peter to James, contained in the *Homilies* of the same Clement, and which are to be found inserted in the false decretals of the Popes.[3]

Against all such attempts, as against that of April 8, 1546, no doubt the voice of the Eastern Church would have been raised, with that of the Ancient Church, and of the Reformed Churches.

But at least there would not have been against it, as in the case of the Apocrypha, the direct testimony of Jesus Christ, who, if He could say nothing on the yet future canon of the New Testament, has said much on that of the Old. Besides, there was in its favour the hesitation of the churches, before the final fixation of the canon, while the history of the Old Testament does not furnish, directly at least, any analogous fact as to the formation of its own canon.

[1] See Propp. 622–625.

[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., vi., 13. Jerome, De Script., cap. xv.

[3] Cave, Hist. Litt. Scriptor. Eccl., i., p. 30. (Basileæ, 1741.)

621. We see, then, that there was antecedently every r humanly speaking, to expect that the doctors of Rome, i made any attempt against the Scriptures, would undert rather against the New Testament than the Old. For what r has the contrary happened? For what reason has there bee eagerness for the one, such modest abstinence from the What has been wanting that they should not dare to dc what they have dared to do elsewhere with so much su Facility has not been wanting, as we have said; temptatio not been wanting; nor the servility of bishops, nor the se of their flocks. Let us answer with the Word—the diff comes from on high. *The oracles of God* contained in th Testament were *intrusted to the Jews*, good or bad, and r Christians; the oracles of God contained in the New Test are confided to Christian churches, good or bad.

There is no other answer; let us not attempt any other. one case God loosens the reins, in the other He holds them in since the fixation of the canon, He has never permitted any c in Christendom to vacillate in its testimony. However le or however ignorant it may be, He deprives it of the power the will, so that you may almost say of Christian churches Josephus said of the Jews, "Never did any dare to take aw add, or transpose anything."[1] The churches, then, have been ful to their trust for the last 1500 years, as the Jewish people been to theirs for the last thirty-four centuries; God controlli this one point the indocility of both, by an influence to whicl are subject without feeling it. And just as God, to render fidelity of the Jews more manifestly providential, exhibits it in the midst of their constant revolt; so, to render the fideli the Church of Rome respecting the New Testament more div significant, and, at the same time, to confound her foolish ass tion of being the infallible interpreter of both Testaments, has given her up, in regard to the Old Testament, with whicl was not intrusted, to a spirit of error; so that, if with one she deposits impurity in the collection of Moses and the proj with the other she still holds out to us, in their perfect inte

[1] Contra Apion., i., p. 1037. Aureliae Allob., p. 999. Theopneustia, 2d ed.; (1842.) See before, Propp. 435, 457.

all the oracles of the New Testament, in which her revolt is found predicted as that of the Jewish people was in the oracles of the Old Testament.

Let us, then, repeat once more, that in this tenth fact God demonstrates afresh that providence which watches over the canon But there is still another fact—the destinies of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

CHAPTER XII.

THE DESTINIES OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION FIRST.

THE VARIATIONS OF ROME THREE TIMES IN THREE HUNDRED YEARS.

622. *Fact the Eleventh.*—If you compare the astonishin tions of the Latin churches on the subject of this book du three first centuries of Christianity, with their immovable during the fifteen centuries that have elapsed since J time to our own, you will be forced to recognise again th vention of an invisible power in this inexplicable contra one firmly-established historical fact[1] is, first of all, t canonicity of this scripture, constantly maintained in t down to the present day, was equally maintained in th during the century and a half that followed its first app And then another historical fact is not less established, th this century and a half the Latin churches, but especially Rome, allowed themselves to be prejudiced against the epis rejected it for another century and a half.

The first of these two facts is abundantly attested, as first century and the beginning of the second, by the ep Clement; and, as to the end of the second and the begin the third, by the work, recently discovered, of Hippoly martyr.

But the second of these two facts is not less attested temporary authors, among others by Eusebius,[2] Jerom

[1] See Prop. 300, &c.

[2] Hist. Eccles., iii, 3.

[3] De Viris Illustribus, cap. lix. :—Cajus sub Zephyrino—disputationem

Philastrius. Now, this error of the Latin churches was begun under Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, (from 202 to 219,) and under Calistus, his successor, (from 219 to 223,) by a priest of that city named Caius, whom Eusebius has often cited, and who, in a famous dispute with the Montanists, was the first to question the *Pauline* authorship of this epistle, on account of the advantages it seemed to give his adversaries in their ardent disputes about discipline. From the time of Caius, the credit of the epistle among the Latins rapidly diminished; and while in the East they firmly persisted in holding it to be canonical and written by Paul, the churches of the West, and especially that of Rome, ceased to read it in their assemblies or to regard it as an inspired book.

We wish you to recollect the testimonies, already cited, of Jerome and Eusebius, and add to them that of Philastrius, the intimate friend of Ambrose, in 380. In his book *De Haeresibus*, at the 34th article, entitled "*Heresy of some persons on the subject of the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews*"—"Some persons also," he says, "maintain that it is not his." "They read in the church only his thirteen epistles, and sometimes that to the Hebrews."

623. Such, then, have been three times in the course of three hundred years the variations of Rome on this important subject; until at last the hour for the providential fixation of the canon having struck, all the Latin churches, as if by concert, embraced the orthodox testimony of the Eastern churches, and thus, by a new revolution, returned to the sound doctrine of the canon.

SECTION SECOND.

THE FIRMNESS OF ROME SINCE THE FIXATION OF THE CANON.

624. Now, then, I ask—After such great changes of opinion, happening at so short a distance from the days of the apostles, and at a time much less impure than subsequent ages, was there not reason to expect that these same Latin churches would vacillate still more in the course of ages? And is not the immovable firmness exceedingly striking which they have shewn for the fif-

Proculum, *Montani* sectatorem valde insignem habuit. . . et in eodem volumine epistolas Pauli *tredecim* tantum enumerans, dicit *ejus non esse;* sed et *apud Romanos usque hodie* quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur."

teen centuries that have elapsed between Jerome's time and o Whence, then, this contrast? so much inconstancy in these b days—so much fidelity in the worst? Whence came this *he* (as Philastrius calls it)—a heresy so precocious, in a church visi and almost founded, so short a time before, by the very autho the epistle, and governed after him by his disciple Clème Whence came it, only a hundred years after Clement, who himself in Rome so often cited this epistle, (as we have seen,) yet at a time when the whole East remained invariably faith to it? And afterwards, how came it to pass that there was prompt and universal a return to the truth that had been ab doned for a century and a half? But let us say more—for h is what more than all is inexplicable without Divine intervention How comes it to pass that henceforward, during the course of fift hundred years, these same churches, in times far more corrupt th those of Jerome, have never hestitated again in their testimo notwithstanding they have erred on so many other points?

This epistle, so long regarded as inspired, then rejected for century and a half, is all at once, by a spontaneous movement without any human mandate—without premeditated concert everywhere received again a second time as canonical. And th what is still more extraordinary, from that moment to our o days, this question has been no longer a matter of doubt in a church. Among the Latin churches, that were so long refracto there has been no hesitation for fifteen hundred years; and if t often, the Caiuses of former times may be seen again publishi their scepticism about some book of the New Testament, you w not find a single church that will listen to or follow them, now t canon has been providentially fixed!

625. We assert once more, for the eleventh time, that this con from on high; and we think that no one can give any other a quate and satisfactory answer. God has guaranteed His writt Word, for the simple reason that it was God who formed it; a to accomplish this object, He stretched forth one hand invisi over the synagogues, and the other over the churches.

"The living oracles have been intrusted to them."

Section Third.

TWO CONSIDERATIONS WHICH RENDER THIS PROOF MORE STRIKING.

626. When, in reading history, you come to this vacillation in the Latin churches during the times of Caius and Pope Zephyrinus,[1] you will generally find the two following reasons given for it. It was owing, in part, it is said, to the degeneracy of the empire at this epoch, especially in the capital of the empire, and under the vicious but tolerant reigns of Commodus, Caracalla, and Heliogabalus. The Christians, protected by Marcia, the mistress of Commodus, and by Mammaea, the aunt of Heliogabalus, became wealthy and corrupt; while the bishops of Rome, Zephyrinus and Callistus, (under whom Caius flourished,) were very far from being what the *False Decretals* and the Roman *Breviary* have made them, saints and martyrs, whose feasts are to be celebrated on August 26 and October 14. On the testimony of Hippolytus,[2] their contemporary, Callistus and Zephyrinus were most despicable men, the one for his avarice and venality, the other for his greediness and malpractices. But if this decay of the Latin Church in the third century will account in part for its error respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, how much more wonderful is its universal return to sound doctrine in the more corrupt times of Jerome; and still more, its unshaken firmness in the twelve still darker ages between Jerome and the Reformation?

627. The second reason given by the fathers for the relinquishment of this epistle by the churches of the West, was the anxiety of the Latin doctors, in their controversies, to get rid of some passages which unfortunately seemed to them to favour the error of the Montanists and Novatianists. But how much more seductive must this evil temptation to reject the epistle have become, some centuries later, when its powerful opposition to all the doctrines of the mass became apparent? when it was discovered with what copiousness and precision Paul had combated beforehand, in this

[1] Hieron, De Viris Illustrib., cap. lix.

[2] Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσιων ἔλεγχος. See Bunsen's Hippolytus and his Age, (Five Letters to Archdeacon Hare,) vol. i., p. 126–131. Callistus, the *protégé* of Zephyrinus, was condemned to the mines in Sardinia, not for his faith, but his frauds.

admirable epistle, the very recent doctrine in which it was darin asserted that the priests, as sacrificers in the place of Jesus Chr offer to God daily on a hundred thousand altars, for the sins of living and the dead, the true flesh and true divinity of Christ, this as really as they were offered to Him the first time by Ch Himself on the cross of Golgotha![1]—a doctrine by which enemy endeavours to turn away our regards from the death Jesus Christ, and to substitute for them a magic miracle perfor by the priest! Is it possible to erect a new altar without o turning that of the cross, on which Jesus Christ offered Him once, as a sacrifice for our sins, with an eternal efficacy? Do not destroy His testament of grace, in which He assures us of remission of our sins, if we substitute for it another made by a n human being? Do we not destroy His real and perpetual pri hood, if we place in its room miserable sinners? and is not s an act an attempt at snatching Him from the right hand of Father, where He is seated for ever as an only priest, merc compassionate, faithful, holy, without spot, separate from sinr made higher than the heavens, and Mediator between God man?

628. I ask, then, might it not be expected, with such a doct preached everywhere, that in the course of so many ages a g number of Caiuses would spring up in the Roman Church, to a second time for the rejection of this dangerous Epistle to Hebrews as impossible to be apostolic?—this epistle, in which mass is beforehand so powerfully condemned? this epistle, in wl it is said of Christ so repeatedly, that "He offered Himself up *o* (vii. 27;) that "He was *once* offered to bear the sins of many, will appear unto them that look for Him the second time witl sin unto salvation," (ix. 28;) that "He is a priest for ever, a the order of Melchisedec," (v. 6, ix. 12;) and that "having off ONE SACRIFICE for sin, He has sat down for ever at the right h of God," (x. 11, 12;) that He possesses an unchangeable, intr missible priesthood, (vii. 24;) that "by one offering He hath ever perfected them that are sanctified," (x. 14;) because "w there is remission of sins, there is no more offering for

[1] Missale Romanum (Oblatio Hostiae):—"Suscipe, Sancte Pater," &c.

(x. 18;) in a word, He does not offer Himself many times, "for then He must often have suffered since the foundation of the world, but now *once*, in the consummation of the ages, He hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," (ix. 26.)

629. Now, after reading so many precise declarations so often repeated, and with an intention so manifestly prophetic, how could you have thought it possible, when the mass had become prevalent, that such a practice and the Epistle to the Hebrews could subsist together for ten years only in the same church? Could it be thought possible that Rome, after having, against the judgment of the whole Eastern Church, rejected this book for a century and a half, (when as yet she was entirely ignorant of the sacrifice of the mass and the adoration of the host,) should undertake to guard it for fourteen hundred years down to our days, after she had set forth all those doctrines which destroy the supper of the Lord, deny His priesthood, turn away our regards from His expiatory death, and substitute the magical and material miracle of transubstantiation for the spiritual and majestic miracle of grace by which the believer, and the believer only, divinely eats the flesh and divinely drinks the blood of his Saviour?[1]

630. What, then, shall we say to these things? We shall say that here again, what, according to all probability, must needs happen, has not happened, and what, humanly speaking, ought

[1] The miracle, as the priest understands it, causes this Divine body to be eaten by unbelievers, and even by animals. "*Si hostia consecrata dispareat*," says the Roman Missal, "*ab aliquo animali accepta*," (De Defectu Panis, iii., 7;) while we say, as St Augustin has often said, that "to eat this food is to abide in Christ, and to have Him abiding in us; because to believe in Him is to eat the bread of life. Why dost thou prepare the teeth and the stomach? Believe, and thou hast eaten." (In Ev. Joh., cap. vi., Tract. xxv.) "Hoc est manducare illam escam—in Christo manere et illum manentum in se habere. Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti." (Ibid., Tract. xxv.) "Quomodo in coelum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? *Fidem mitte et tenuisti*." (In Ev. Joh., cap. xi. et xii. Tract. iv.; Edit. Bened., Paris, 1659, tom. iii., pp. 630, 490, 501, 4911.)

And again (August., De Doctr. Chr., lib. iii., p. 52):—"Si praeceptiva locutio est, aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, *non est figurata*. Si autem flagitia aut facinus videtur jubere, *figurata est*. Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis, non habebitis vitam in vobis; facinus videtur aut flagitium jubere. *Figura ergo est;* praecipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoriâ, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa est et vulnerata."

not to take place, has been accomplished. We shall
the strange course of events relative to the Epistle to t
in the Latin Church, before, and during, and after the
fixation of the canon, there has been most manifestly
of that divine agency which protects the Scriptures.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE GREAT MANIFESTATIONS OF THAT PROVIDENCE WHICH PRESERVES THE ORACLES OF GOD, RENDERING IT VISIBLE ON THREE OCCASIONS IN THE STORMY TIMES OF DIOCLETIAN, OF CHARLES V., AND OF NAPOLEON I.

631. We may see from time to time in history, both before and since the coming of Jesus Christ, some of those splendid dispensations in which, if I may venture to use the language of Isaiah, "*Jehovah makes bare his holy arm in the sight of all the nations,*" (Is. lii. 10,) and forces all the ends of the earth to acknowledge that He takes in hand the cause of His written Word, and, after having given it by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, He will shake the whole world, if need be, in order to preserve it from age to age for His elect, to restore it to them when it seems lost, and finally to spread it over all the earth.

Without speaking of the great things accomplished under the old covenant, we shall confine ourselves to those that have been done under the new, and of these latter we shall specify three. We grant that all three do not apply, like the preceding, to the details of the canon; but all three alike strikingly exhibit that watchful power which guards the Scriptures. It has changed the world, it has created the Church, it has regenerated the elect to the life of God, and it is no strange work to expect from Him when the point in question is to preserve it for them.

Section First.

632. *Fact the Twelfth.*—The first of these three great divine interventions is the wonderful preservation of the Scriptures at

the end of the unheard of persecutions which marked th
ning of the fourth century, in the days of Diocletian, ar
preceded the triumphs of Christianity.

All the potentates of the earth were at that time c
with the same fury against the people of God, and all
having alike recognised that what gave them energy,
and powerful unity, was the Holy Word, they manife
same fury against the Bibles of Christians as against t
sons, in order to give them to the flames and to destroy t

This unparalleled crisis, which shook the whole know
and deluged it with the blood of the saints, began
Friday in the year 303.

It remains unparalleled in history for its extent, its dur
intensity, and its means of success. Its extent was w
then called the whole world; there appeared to be a
combination for the ruin of Christianity and its sacre
Its duration was for ten long years. All kinds of pur
were employed; there was a deluge of Christian blood;
empires of the East and the West devoted themselves at o
under the united efforts of all their Cæsars and all their
—Diocletian, Maximian, Maxentius, Galerius, Maximin,
—all joined in the work, as well as the vast empire of the
under the cruel Sapor. While the Holy Scriptures wer
where committed to the flames in public places, the bloc
who persisted in avowing the Christian name—men, wor
young children—flowed by horrible punishments at the sa
in Armenia, in Egypt, in the Thebais, even to Maurit
Mesopotamia, at Tyre, at Gaza, in Cappadocia, in Po
Gaul, in Pannonia, in Spain, in the island as far as Brit
Egypt alone a million victims were computed to have lo
lives.

The imperial edicts were first published in the city of Ni
on the morning of the 28th of March, in the nineteenth
Diocletian, and were immediately sent to the Eastern and
empires. They enjoined first of all that in every place the
Books should be burnt,—that all the bishops and priests sh
cast into prison,—that every Christian should be imm

deprived of every public office,—and that all should be required, under pain of death, to deny Jesus Christ, to give up their copies of the Scriptures, and to sacrifice to the gods. These edicts were immediately put into execution in all quarters, beginning at Nicomedia, where twenty thousand believers were put to death, and were the occasion everywhere else of unheard of cruelties. "We have seen with our own eyes the inspired and Sacred Scriptures delivered to the flames in the public places," says the learned Eusebius.[1] He was at that time in Egypt, and tells us as an eyewitness[2] of the punishments of all kinds with their horrible details, to which multitudes of believers were subjected who were resolved not to give up the Holy Word, but to confess their Master to their last breath. After being scourged, they were delivered up to ferocious beasts, and to tortures of all kinds. If any one would wish to form an idea of these infernal cruelties let him read the letter of Phileas, bishop of Thmois, in which he describes them to the people of his charge.[3] In Mesopotamia the martyrs were hung with their heads downwards over a slow fire; in Cappadocia they dislocated their limbs; in Syria they drowned them; at Tyre they were thrown to wild beasts; in Arabia they were beheaded; in Phrygia they burnt them alive by whole families in their houses. In Rome, during the games in the circus, all the people were heard to cry out a dozen times, "Let the Christians be put to death!" and the emperor as often replied, "There are no more Christians." The abjurations, in all places, in sight of the tortures prepared for them, were innumerable; and the emperors themselves might hope, like Louis XIV. in the time of the dragonnades, that they had destroyed for ever those whom they persecuted. The number of the *παραδόται* or *traditores* (as those were called who gave up their Bibles) appeared immense, and their cowardice gave birth in Africa after a while to the *Donatists*. Hosts of bishops, priests, and deacons, were seen to waver when they beheld the instruments of punishment, and thousands of men and women, of rich and poor, all alike

[1] Hist. Eccl., viii., 2:—*Τὰς δὲ ἐνθέους καὶ ἱερὰς γραφὰς κατὰ μέσας ἀγορὰς πυρὶ παραδιδομένας αὐτοῖς ἐπείδομεν ὀφθαλμοῖς.*

[2] Ibid., viii., 7:—*Οἷς γιγνομένοις καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν.*

[3] Ibid., viii., 10.

terrified, threw on the altar of the gods the grain of incen
had been forced into their hands.

633. The evil-doers might believe that they had attain
object; but while the Church by this sifting of fire got
multitude of unconverted professors, and came forth pu
Holy Scriptures were also seen, thrown into the flames wi
number of religious books that have never been recovere
which the greater part probably were an encumbrance ra
an advantage, the Holy Scriptures we say issued from the
more efficacious, more valued, and better understood, tha

The persecutors would not thus judge. Reckoning, o
hand, the crowd of bishops and their flocks, whom the pr
a cruel death had caused to apostatise, and on the other
number of invincible martyrs who had been utterly dest
capital punishments, they took no account of a conc
immense multitude of persons, on whom their examples, a
the secret testimonies of the Holy Word, had operated i
and who were preparing in their turn to stand up for t
deemer. Their enemies might think they had annihil
Church, and finished the Word of God from the earth
tianity seemed for a time to have no footing in the wo
emperors frequently congratulated themselves upon it,
height of their thrones, and in the solemn assemblies of th
They flattered themselves with having so completely anni
that they caused medals to be struck (which are still ex
commemoration of their triumph over the odious supersti
erected monumental columns, which have been discovered
even in Spain, with this inscription, "EXSTINCTO NOMINI
TIANORUM," "the name of the Christians being everywhe
guished, and their superstition banished from the world."

634. Such at that time was the almost total destructio
sacred books, that, at the present day, there scarcely a
be found in the whole world, of a date anterior to thos
days, or even contemporaneous. Among all the Greek
scripts of the New Testament, amounting to eleven hund
sacred criticism has been able to recover in all the lib
Europe, Egypt and Asia, not a single one can be met w

[1] "Nomine Christianorum deleto." See Milner, Church History, 18

goes back to the time of this persecution. All have disappeared; and our most ancient Greek manuscripts are only very late transcriptions of a small number of copies that escaped the imperial fury.

The Alexandrian manuscripts in the British Museum, (A of Griesbach) is not earlier, Michaelis[1] says, than the end of the fourth century, because it contains the epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus on the Psalms. The Vatican manuscript (B of Griesbach) is also not earlier than the same epoch; Montfaucon and Bishop Marsh even believe it to be of the fifth or sixth century, and Dupin of the seventh. The Cambridge manuscript, or Beza's,[2] (D,) is referred to the sixth century by its warmest partisans; that of Clermont, (D,) to the sixth century by Griesbach; that of Ephrem, (C Palimpsest,) to the seventh by Marsh; and that of Oxford, or Laud's, (E of Griesbach,) to the same century. These are the most ancient.[3]

635. But in the midst of this dreadful tempest, destined to glorify the Church by purifying it, and the Holy Word by raising it as from the sepulchre, Heaven was at last seen to interpose by a succession of rapid and severe judgments; all the persecutors

[1] Michaelis, Introduction, ii., 141. (French translation.)

[2] So called because presented by Beza to the University of Cambridge in 1581.

[3] In the month of April last year, (1859,) M. Tischendorf announced to the learned world, in the *Augsburg Gazette*, the rich discovery he had just made, at Mount Sinai, of a very beautiful and ancient Greek manuscript of the Old and New Testaments. He placed it without hesitation in the first rank, above all the manuscripts possessed in the present day, for its antiquity, careful execution, and perfect preservation. He believes it belongs to the first half of the fourth century. It has been deposited at St Petersburg, and a fac-simile is expected to be made of it within three years. It is written on 346 very large sheets of fine parchment, and the text is arranged on every sheet in four columns.

In our 43d Prop., mentioning the fifty copies of the Divine Scriptures, splendidly copied by the care of Eusebius of Caesarea, at the request and expense of the Emperor Constantine, I said how precious a prize it would be if, by one of those unforeseen occurrences reserved to the Church from time to time by the Divine goodness, one of these manuscripts, more ancient than any it possesses, could be discovered in some retreat hitherto unexplored. I was far from suspecting that, when writing those lines in the first part of this work, this favour would be so soon granted by the discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript. Yet I cannot venture to believe that this is one of those copies due to the care of Eusebius and the zeal of Constantine. The Russian Government, the *Record* says, (May 1860,) has devoted 500,000 rubles to the printing of the manuscript.

were smitten by God; and Lactantius had to write his fa
De Mortibus Persecutorum. The Caesar Severus, so cru
the Christians, was betrayed and strangled; the Empe
mian strangled himself; the Emperor Galerius, arres
career of blood by a manifest stroke of Divine veng
himself obliged to acknowledge the hand of Divine r
Seized with an ulceration which spread over his wh
and transported with rage, at first he ordered all his ph
be put to death; but soon, devoured by so many worms
seemed inexhaustible, and unable to doubt that his
bore the marks of Divine wrath, he revoked on his dea
edict of persecution. The Emperor Maxentius, put to t
the gates of Rome, fell with all his armour on into the
the Tiber; and shortly after, the people of that capital, s
witnesses of his cruelty, saw his head, hitherto so dread
into Rome at the end of a lance, and paraded from pla
with shouts of joy. Diocletian, obliged to see at last wi
eyes the hated triumph of Christianity, poisoned himself
Eusebius, who was then living, assures us that his body,
falling to pieces, struck him with horror, and the fing
seemed as if visible in his dreadful death. But a stil
malady seized the cruel Maximin, and shewed to ever
God had smitten him; for a burning fire, obstinate an
seated, which increased in spite of all remedies, and in it
deprived him of eyesight, consumed him in such a ma
his parched body seemed, Eusebius tells us, nothing bet
skeleton, or an infected sepulchre in which his soul wa
He himself saw that an avenging God was the cause
ments; he called for death, and it came not. Lastly,
Licinius, defeated and dethroned, but pardoned by Co
attempted a fresh conspiracy, and was strangled.

Yet while God thus visibly smote all these persecutors
tianity and the Holy Scriptures, He caused His word of
triumph. He honoured it by the most noble martyrs;
threw for ever the gods of Olympus. Those false di
adored and feared over all the earth from a remote an
fell before the Holy Scriptures like Dagon before the A

[1] Hist. Eccl., ix., 10.

though adored from time immemorial in ten thousand temples, they vanished, even from the imaginations of men, like so many forgotten diseases. In a short time they would be spoken of only in games and fables.

636. At the same time, honour was everywhere rendered to the written Word. It was disinterred as from sepulchres in which it had been concealed. It was re-copied in every country with the greatest care, in order to circulate it in all directions. It was like Noah and his three sons coming forth from the ark after the deluge to repeople the earth. And only twelve years after this tremendous storm had ceased, the Emperor Constantine was seen, in the first general council of Christendom, placing the Bible on a throne in the midst of the assembly, to signify that it is, and must ever be, the sovereign rule of conscience, and the sole infallible judge of divine truth.

637. In vain had all the powers of earth set themselves in array against the Church and against the Scriptures of God, "imagining vain things, and taking counsel together against Jehovah and against his Anointed;" "He that sitteth in the heavens laughed; Jehovah had them in derision; He spake to them in His wrath," (Ps. ii. 2, 4;) and all their rage only served more fully to display the Divine origin both of His Church and of His Word. This living and abiding Word has ever reappeared to change and to govern the world.

"How is it," exclaims the pious Le Sueur, in his *History of the Church and the Empire*, "how is it that an immense number of other books, and even the works of the greatest men, and the most learned authors of antiquity,—those of the Chaldeans, of the Egyptians, the Arabians, the Greeks, and the Romans,—those writings which men studied with so much care,—have utterly perished; and, on the contrary, the Holy Scriptures, the very memory of which so many tyrants have exerted themselves to annihilate, have come down to us entire and uninjured? How is it, again, that the very histories of the most powerful empires have disappeared, while that of the despised people of Judea, and that of the establishment of the Church, more despised still, in its beginning as ancient as the world, has remained in its completeness? Must we not," he adds, "acknowledge in all these facts

that God, because this Holy Scripture proceeded from resolved, in spite of so many obstacles, to preserve it mir not by arms or by human means, but by almost constant and by His adorable providence?"

God, then, watches over His written Word. This is a wish to infer from this first dispensation in the days stantine.

But there is a still more striking dispensation which afresh the face of the world in the times of the powerful and of the brilliant Leo X. This was destined to mani than ever to the whole world the holy jealousy of Goc written Word. I refer to the blessed Reformation.

SECTION SECOND.

THE REFORMATION.

638. *Fact the Thirteenth.*—The blessed Reformation, regions where its voice could make itself heard, raised from the sepulchre in which, for 900 years, the tradition had held it entombed.

In restoring it to the nations, it accomplished in a years, by means of this very Bible rescued from the tomb, powerful, the deepest, and the holiest of the religious re which have agitated the world since the establishmen gospel, and shewed, by most conspicuous signs, the care takes of His sacred canon. That revolution which place tianity on the throne of the Caesars in the days of Consta Great was no doubt powerful, but rather as a sovereig Providence than as a work of the Holy Spirit; while th mation was eminently a work of the Holy Word, and wa plished, above all, in the interior and spiritual governmer house of God. I do not refer to the human conflicts w lowed it; I refer to its origin, its primary characteristics, spiritual grandeur of its operations.

We may denominate this unparalleled event *the resurr the Scriptures by a Divine Power.* That Power drew th the sepulchre in spite of all the great ones of this wo when it had thus restored them to open day by a strong

immediately renewed, by means of them, the wonder of ancient days. That divine Word regenerated millions of souls to the life of faith ; it sustained even in the hour of punishment the multitude of martyrs who were dragged to the scaffold for the sole crime of having read it in the vulgar tongue ; it freed the half of Europe from the yoke of Rome ; it changed the face of the world. So that, to every serious person who studies closely the origin and primary development of this holy revolution, it became very evident that God had placed Himself at the head of this vast movement, because He meant to maintain a Church on earth, and, in order to maintain it, it has been needful to restore from age to age His word of truth.

639. This event is too well known in our days, even in its details,[1] to require us to recall the history of it. But it is necessary that we should clearly understand all the force of its testimony in favour of the canon, and, for this purpose, we wish to point out the two principal facts that characterise it. First of all, it must be shewn to what extent the written Word, when the Reformation took place, had disappeared from the face of the earth, and that for 900 years. Then it must be considered with what power, evidently divine, I would say with what majestic unity, with what superhuman rapidity, with what holiness, with what an outstretched arm, the holy Reformation, from the moment it had drawn forth the written Word from its catacombs, and replaced it in a conspicuous position in the house of God, brought forth its most precious fruits, like those of ancient days. In a few years this Word, but just come forth from the sepulchre, and by means apparently the feeblest, was seen to rise like the sun in the firmament of the Reformed Churches, in order to become their supreme rule, and to prepare for the promised day when it shall govern the whole world, and all the tribes of the earth shall walk in the light of it.

This twelfth proof does not refer, it is true, any more than the one before it, to the sixty-six books in detail which compose the canon, as is the case with the other proofs ; but in giving the testimony of God to the Bible as a whole, it obliges us to acknow-

[1] Especially by the admirable labours of my friend M. Merle d'Aubigné, whose volumes are read with the same vivid interest in the New and in the Old World, and by all classes.

ledge once more with what jealousy He sovereignly preserve age to age the venerable collection of His sacred oracles.

640. The Scriptures had at that time disappeared almo tirely from the face of the earth. This fact is perhaps not ciently known in our days.

Ever since the year 400 of the Christian era, the invasi the barbarians had occasioned in Europe that fatal forgetf of the Holy Word, which, of course, rapidly impoverishe spirituality of all the Western churches. The admirable Au who had been their most brilliant light, and who was alwa tinguished among them as *the man of the Scriptures*, dr last breath at the approach of the Vandals, already mast Africa, and encamped under the walls of Hippo. Already, a quarter of a century, Alaric and his Goths had invaded Spain, and Italy, and had burnt the city of Rome. Attila his Huns, only seventeen years after the death of Au having laid waste Eastern Europe, as far as Thermopylae, on to the West. Then, immediately after him, the Vandals, Genseric, crossing over into Sicily with 300,000 men, in turn ravaged the imperial city. Only a quarter of a centur Odoacer, coming from Pannonia with his Heruli, in 476, end to the empire of the West, was proclaimed king of Ital took possession of Rome. After him came the Lombards a Franks.

It will be readily understood that, in the midst of these c tions, secular learning and the study of the Scriptures were lost, even among the priests. The Latin *Breviary*, the *Missal* tions, and human rites had taken their place. We may form idea of what brilliant Italy had become in 680, when we re answer of Pope Agathon to the Emperor Constantine Pog who had addressed to him an *imperial injunction* to his deputies to the great oecumenical council which he had called in the capital of the East.[1] Agathon could not all Italy any theologian sufficiently versed in the Sacred Scr to undertake this office. "I beg you, my lord," he said, " cept our deputies, though indifferent scholars, and not suffi versed in the Holy Scriptures. And I do not conceal fro

[1] The sixth in Trullo, in 680.

that to obtain a theologian, it would be necessary to seek for one in England, on account of the frequent incursions we have suffered from the barbarians."[1]

But later still matters became worse, as human traditions multiplied; for, henceforward, this ignorance of the Scriptures was succeeded by the most vivid distrust, and very soon by the most violent opposition against any use whatever of the holy book in the vulgar tongue.

641. The use of the Scriptures, we have already seen, was severely interdicted; through some ages it was forbidden under pain of death. Among the Vaudois, the Paulicians, the Albigenses, the poor men of Lyons, the Lollards, and the Bohemians, its powerful action upon their consciences had been recognised; for, "as the loadstone always attracts iron, so," says Theodoret, "the Holy Scriptures will always and everywhere attract pious souls." And when it attracts them, it leads them to Jesus Christ, and makes them seek, at any price, eternal life. They no longer fear any menace of men; and the reproach of Christ appears to them of far greater value than all the treasures of this world.

The Bible in the vulgar tongue was become in the eyes of the priests a dangerous book; "by perverse interpretations of which," as Leo XII. said, "the gospel of Christ is converted into the gospel of the devil."[2] Consequently it was everywhere prohibited; it vanished, as it were, underground; it descended into the tomb. We shall not resume the consideration of those decrees of death promulgated first of all by the Council of Toulouse, and followed for five hundred years by innumerable punishments, in which the blood of the saints flowed like water.[3]

But, that every one may form a correct idea of what this death of the Scriptures was in Europe, and of that Divine power of the resurrection which delivered them from it, all must see at what cost the Bible issued from its tomb—issued, translated into all the vernacular languages of Europe, and came forth unveiled for all nations.

[1] Le Sueur, Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire, part vi., p. 212; Genève, 1672.

[2] See Prop. 558.

[3] We have sufficiently referred to these acts and decrees in Propp. 552–557, 560–563.

For the men whom the Lord engaged first in this sacre this was at the cost of unheard-of privations, of constant ring dangers, and often, at last, of cruel punishments. in their places of exile, and in the most concealed retreats, from hunger and cold, from reproach and poverty. It w light of funeral-piles that they studied that recovered W they translated it in secret, that they printed and circulat

Certainly, for such men it required a mighty influe above, to choose such a life, and to prepare for such deat Reformation which went forth to change the world, need all to begin its holy work in their own hearts, by regenerat and establishing in them, by means of faith, that spiritua righteousness, peace, and joy by the Holy Spirit, whi renders the Christian capable of undertaking everything fering everything in the cause of his Redeemer.

Follow these great men of God in their career for quarter of the sixteenth century. The hour prepared fr is arrived at once for many countries; behold! the Ref is begun! Very soon you will hear its mighty voice, lik a roaring lion; and in a few years the aspect of the worl changed. "Send forth thy spirit, O Jehovah, they are thou renewest the face of the earth . . . . it is satisfied with of thy works," (Ps. civ. 30, 13.) See Zwinglius in Swi See Luther in Germany! In spite of his safe-conduct, he ca from Worms alive, but menaced with a thousand deaths: f six years after, and on the point of breathing his last, C declared that he repented of having respected his safe-con of having allowed him to live. See the reformer in his the Wartburg: he has already translated the New Testame and very soon all the German population will be able to from one end of Germany to the other. See Le Fevr following year, translating it into French for the Frenc again, in France, the poor but learned Olivetan, Calvin's and see him with the poor Vaudois, who, in their extreme assist him with the means of publishing a cheap editio translation of the Bible; and, apparently rich by their l church after church, they tax themselves with the expens

[1] In 1523. Luther's Bible did not appear till 1530.

great work, and proceed to have it printed in the principality of Neufchatel, in Switzerland.[1]

See at the same time Tyndal, in England, fleeing from his native country never to return, concealing himself first in one city and then in another on the banks of the Rhine, from his persecutors, till at last he was enabled, according to his heart's desire, to give to the English, in English, the Word of their God. See him till the day when, for having done this work, he will, by order of the king of England and the emperor of Germany, be hunted out, betrayed, thrown into prison, strangled, and burnt! See his two fellow-labourers, Bilney and Frith, seized for the same crime, and burnt alive in England! All three had been prepared by God for this task; they were learned in the sacred languages; with secular knowledge they had also faith; and all three took their life in their hands to offer it to their Redeemer. But at last, behold the angel of the Reformation, who only waited till they had ended their work, to commence his own, and who made his mighty voice resound through all Europe like the roaring of a lion. Very soon thousands of confessors and martyrs will shew themselves in France, in Germany, in England, in Italy, in Flanders, in Belgium, in Holland, in Spain, in Poland, in Transylvania, in Bohemia, in Hungary, in Denmark and Sweden, and the world will appear shaken to its foundations.

I confess that nothing has made me discern more vividly the Divine grandeur of this dispensation, and the profound interment from which the Scriptures then came forth, than to trace the labours and sufferings of these men of God in order to give His Holy Word to their generation. Trace Tyndal's career, and from him judge of all the rest.

642. Having left the English universities, this young and learned scholar lived in peace, happy and respected, in the noble mansion of Sir John Walsh, where he discharged with credit the double office of chaplain and tutor. Sir John and Lady Walsh placed confidence in him, and took delight in hearing him speak of the gospel, with which he had been power-

[1] By Peter de Vingle, June 4, 1535, in the little village of Serrières. They taxed themselves for this heroic charity the enormous sum (for them) of 1500 gold crowns. (Leger, Hist. des Vaudois, p. 165.)

fully impressed by reading the Greek New Testament, v
learned Erasmus had just published at Bâle in 1516, and
it to England in 1519. No sooner was he converted
heroic young man felt a resolution formed in his heart to
everything in order to translate and give to his countr
Scriptures of his God in English. "I will consecrate r
it," he said, "and if necessary, I will sacrifice it;" and
English priest at Sir John Walsh's pointed out to him th
from the laws of the Pope and the artfulness of the priest
the holy imprudence to reply, "For this I will set at de
Pope and all his laws; for I vow, if God spare my lif
England, before a few years are gone by, a ploughman sh
the Scriptures better than I do."[1] He had preached t
fervently in the neighbourhood where he resided; but s
labours too often rendered fruitless by the opposition of th
he said, "Assuredly it would be quite different if this po
had the Scriptures. Without the Scriptures it is impo
establish the laity in the truth."

He was well aware that his life was in peril, and he
willing that his noble friends should share those dangers
was ready to brave alone. He resolved to leave. Only th
before, the same year in which he left Cambridge, t
Thomas Mann had been burnt alive for having professed
trine of the Lollards, which had now become his own;
lady named Smith, the mother of several young chil
having been convicted of making use of a parchment c
were found written in English the Lord's Prayer, the
creed, and the ten commandments. Moreover, every
England recollected that, one hundred and forty years
the pious Wyckliffe, for having attempted the same task
lating the Bible into English for the English, had been c
persecuted; that the House of Lords, and the Convocatio
Clergy in St Paul's, London, had strictly prohibited th
that book; and such was the horror they had of a Bibl

[1] Our readers should follow Tyndal's career as exhibited in the admi
of Merle d'Aubigné, 1854. [The fullest account of Tyndal's life a
labours is contained in Mr Anderson's Annals of the English Bible; 3
London, 1847. A second edition condensed in 1 vol., 1861.—Tr.]

vulgar tongue, that they not only burnt it when they discovered it, but burnt also, with the Bible hanging from their neck, the men who had read it; and better to express in what abhorrence this work was held, they had ordained, forty-four years after his death, that the corpse even of Wyckliffe should not have a secure grave on the soil of England,—that his bones, disinterred, should be burnt, and their ashes thrown into the river Swift.[1] The venerable Lady Jane Boughton, eighty years old, was burnt for reading the Scriptures; her daughter, Lady Young, had to undergo the same punishment. John Bradley, shut up in a chest, was burnt alive in Smithfield before the valiant Henry, then Prince of Wales; and the noble Lord Cobham was burnt on a slow fire in St Giles's.

Tyndal having quitted his protectors, betook himself to London, to seek there, in a more secret retreat, the means of pursuing his sacred work, but soon had reason to fear that punishment would interrupt his task. "Alas! I see it!" he exclaimed, "all England is closed against me!" And as there was then in the Thames a vessel about to sail for Hamburgh, he got on board, having only his New Testament, and for the means of living only £10 sterling. He quitted his native country, and was never to see it again. Nevertheless he left it with a holy confidence. "Our priests," he said, "have buried God's Testament, and all their study is to prevent its being raised from the tomb; but God's hour is come, and nothing henceforward shall prevent His written Word, as in former times nothing could prevent His incarnate Word, from bursting the bonds of the sepulchre, and rising from among the dead."[2] Tyndal augured rightly; but it was the work of God alone.

We must follow this martyr of the Scriptures in his agitated and suffering life, pursued from city to city; first of all to Hamburgh in 1523, where he had to endure every species of privation, poverty, debt, cold, and hunger, with his young and learned friend John Frith, his son in the faith, who had accompanied him to labour in the same work. Yet he had already the satisfaction of sending secretly to his friends in England the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; but he was soon obliged to flee to Cologne to conceal himself again. We must follow him there, especially in his new troubles, where a priest, who had pursued his track,

[1] The Book and its Story, pp. 128–131. [2] Ibid., p. 152.

unexpectedly discovered at a printer's the first eighty pag
book, and hastened to give information of it, both to the
Cologne and the King of England. "Two Englishmen
concealed here, sire," he wrote, "wish, contrary to the
your kingdom, to send the New Testament in English
people. Give orders, sire, in all your ports, to prevent tl
of this most pernicious kind of merchandise."[1] With a
promptitude, Tyndal, forewarned, anticipates the prosecuti
council of Cologne, runs to his printer, and throws him
the first ten sheets already printed, into a vessel that was
the Rhine, and takes refuge in Worms! To disconcert
ceedings of his enemies, he changes the form and size of
from a quarto to an octavo. In vain the Bishop of Lo
already assailed this work, which was so odious in his
denounced it in England. Tyndal, after so many exer
prayers, had the happiness to finish the whole about the enc
and intrusted its conveyance to England to some pious l
merchants, who could not bring it to London but at the per
lives. Let us listen to the man of God thus expressing
joy: "Now, O my God," he exclaims, "take from its sca
which men have kept it so long unused, the sharp-edged
Thy Word; draw forth this powerful weapon, strike
divide soul and spirit, so that the divided man shall be at
himself, but at peace with Thee." And we may see
bishop secretly commissioning a merchant to purchase t
edition, in order to give it to the flames, and Tyndal at a
receiving the money, which will enable him to pay his d
prepare immediately another edition better printed a
correct. Lastly, we have to see this faithful man settled
werp, always in danger, always concealed, always suff
numerable privations, but already at work, commencing l
lation of the Old Testament, with his pious friend, Jo
Nevertheless, for each of them, their labours were soo
and their rest in God was to begin. The king of Engl
secret emissaries to discover Tyndal's retreat, and to s
person. These persons, it is said, were not able to see l
at hand without being almost gained over to his sentime

[1] Merle d'Aubigné, History of the Reformation, v., 308, 309

last he was surprised and betrayed, and the officers at Brussels were prevailed upon to seize him and throw him into prison. There he remained two years, during which time he wrote those admirable letters which we still possess, addressed to his young fellow-labourer, Frith, who having returned to England, was destined very soon to be a martyr before him. On the sixth of October 1536, fastened to a stake in the public square of Augsburg, Tyndal gave up his life for the Holy Word. In his last moments, he was heard to raise his voice, and exclaim aloud, "Lord! open the King of England's eyes!" It was on the application of Henry VIII., and by order of Charles V., that he was taken from Brussels to Augsburg, to undergo the punishment of death. He was strangled, and his body committed to the flames. His son in the faith, and fellow-labourer, the amiable Frith, had been burnt alive at Smithfield, in 1533, for having been engaged in the same work, as also had been, in 1528, the affectionate Thomas Bilney, the friend of his youth, with whom he had so devoutly commenced his labours.

643. In this manner the Holy Scriptures were brought back to England in 1525. They returned moistened with the blood of their translators and martyrs, at the same time when other faithful men of God, exposed to similar conflicts, and braving similar dangers, translated them into the language of their respective countries, and restored them equally to the Church of God.

Other affecting recitals of the same kind might be given, relating to those struggles out of which the Scriptures made their way as from the tomb, to render the first calls of the Reformation audible to God's chosen ones. For, independently of the translations which were then made of the New Testament, the whole Bible was translated into Flemish in 1526,[1] into German, by Luther, in 1530; into French, by Olivetan, in 1535;[2] into English, by Tyndal and Coverdale, in 1535; into Bohemian, by the

[1] Reuss, Geschichte der Schriften N. T., §§ 470–477. Le Fevre had finished his translation of the New Testament in 1523.

[2] The College of La Tour in the Valleys possesses a copy of it. At the end of the volume the acrostic verses indicate to whom the edition was owing. Joining the initial letters we shall read—

"Les Vaudois, peuple évangélique,
Ont mis ce tresor en publique."

United Brethren, ever since 1488; into Swedish, by La
into Danish, in 1550; into Polish, in 1551; into It
Bruccioli, in 1532, and by Teofilo in 1550; into Spani
Reyna, in 1569; into French-Basque, by order of the
Navarre, in 1571; into Sclavonian, in 1581; into the la
Carniola, in 1581; into Icelandic, in 1584; into W
Morgan, in 1588; into Hungarian, by Caroli, in 15
Esthonian, by Fischer, in 1589. Thirty versions may be
it is said, for Europe alone.

This universal resurrection of the holy book, and of i
canon, in the face of such obstacles, presents us no doubt
impressive proof of the protection which guards it from ag
but we shall recocognise this protection far better, if we
consider the prodigious effects of this book, whence once
to the sight of the nations.

Those effects were immediate; they were holy; t
everywhere the same; they were similar to those witness
most glorious days of the Church; they were of a power
Divine, by their moral grandeur in the spiritual world
their external grandeur in the political world, or on the
destinies of humanity.

644. Those effects were immediate. Scarcely had the
Bible, Luther's Bible, Tyndal's Bible, Olivetan's Bible, iss
the tomb, but directly the angel of the Reformation
powerful voice from God heard through all Europe. It ca
heaven sudden, unexpected, by the most humble instrum
at once the astonished world felt itself shaken to the fou
Everything indicated an agency from on high. At th
a few months, in Germany, in Switzerland, in France, in
in England, in Scotland, and soon afterwards in Italy, an
Spain, the sheep of Jesus had heard His voice and follow
Great emotions had agitated them. Consciences were a
by the Holy Word. A deep and powerful work had been
in men's souls; and very soon their idols were overthr
their traditions were cast away. They turned to the li
true God, and, like the Thessalonians, "received the Wor
midst of great tribulation, with joy of the Holy Ghost."
hearts were softened; righteousness, peace, and joy, had d

into them. The face of the world was changed, and, after 900 years of slavery, half of Europe appeared already delivered from Rome. Would it then be too daring, in describing this vast movement, so visibly originating from above, to speak of it as the excellent and learned Mr Elliot[1] has done in his exposition of the Prophet of Patmos, and to say with him, that this was the "*mighty angel*" that John saw "come down from heaven clothed in a cloud." "A rainbow was upon his head," a symbol of the peace of God, "and his face was as it were the sun," for he brought to the world the sublime illuminations of faith. His progress was irresistible, "his feet were as pillars of fire." But whence came the power of his progress, its promptitude, its unity, its Divine security? Hearken! He had in his hand a book, a little book, (*βιβλαρίδιον*,) but an *open* book, open and not closed, open to all nations,—the everlasting gospel. Very soon he "placed his right foot on the sea, and his left foot on the earth," for he had to carry beyond the ocean the good news of grace, to lead nations in both hemispheres to the most glorious destinies, and to make known God's salvation to the utmost ends of the earth,—his action was powerful, and "he cried with a loud voice."

We said that this great movement which restored the gospel to the earth came evidently from heaven; and we said that it could be judged at once by its effects, for they were immediate, rapid, holy, everywhere the same, and from a power evidently Divine.

645. They were immediate. Scarcely had the Word of the kingdom been restored to light, and the great "sower had gone forth to sow"[2] in the field of this world, when this seed of God was seen to reproduce its fruits of past times. It happened to this Word, after 900 years of sepulture, what we have seen happen in our day to those peas of ancient Egypt which Sir Gardiner Wilkinson,[3] while examining the mummy-pits of the

[1] In his Horae Apocalypticae, vol. i., p. 39. London, 1851.

[2] Matt. xiii. 4, 19.

[3] The celebrated traveller. See the *Christian Times*, April 6, 1849, p. 574. he peas were shrivelled and as hard as a rock. Mr Grimstone sowed them very carefully on June 4, 1844, and at the end of the 30th he had the pleasure of seeing the pea spring up, which has from that time been named *the mummy pea*, not less prolific than the famous wheat of Egypt so admired by the ancients. Dr Plate has given lectures to the Syro-Egyptian Society on the *mummy pea*.

Pharaohs, found hermetically closed in a vase, and deposit
British Museum; or like those grains in the Celtic
Bergerac, enclosed 2000 years ago by the superstitio
Druidical priests under the heads of the dead, and both
very carefully sown, have reproduced, under the rays of o
in all their primitive freshness, the pea from a hundred p
ancient Egyptians, with its white blossoms streaked with g
the heliotrope, the trefoil, and the centaury of the ancie
from the days of Julius Caesar.

In a very few years, the work shewed its power by i
its organisation, and its energy. Thousands and thou
souls had hastened to the Divine Word; cities, republ
doms, and whole countries had been won over to the
some in great numbers by the direct power of the Hol
others, perhaps, in still larger numbers, by a conviction of t
of Popery, and by the impulse of a universal movemen
gether, it was a number that no man could number. Tl
and Christians themselves, were astonished at it. "Who a
they said, "that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their wi
Isa. lx. 8.

Scarcely had the Bible reappeared, when numerous
societies were formed and constituted in the midst of per
and exposure to death; and the most admirable marty
their testimony to the gospel with the blood of the saints.

And if we wish, from a different point of view, to r
idea more impressive of that powerful and marvellous
with which the light of the Scriptures was propagated, a
were released from traditions and priests to give them
the living and true God, let us rapidly recall some date
astonishing revolution.

646. In Switzerland, where the German was spoken,
ample, the Reformation commenced at the same time as in
Zwinglius arrived at Zurich in 1518. We find
established and constituted there as early as 1522;[1] tl

[1] See Corpus et Syntagma Confessionum Fidei, (Genevi, 1654.) Sumpt
Chouet, (Preface, 9999, iii.)—"Quampridem enim in Helvetiâ, per præc
evangelii, Ecclesiae fuerent instauratae et constitutae, praeter alia
monstrant Constantiensis Episcopi ad Tigurinos literae et Tigurinorum
responsiones, jam anno 1522 typis evulgatæ."

years later, the republic, by a decree of its senate, abolished first of all the worship of images, and in the following year, 1527, the mass with all its accompaniments.

Haller preached the gospel at Berne in 1521; and in 1527 the general edict in favour of the Reformation was passed in that warlike republic, through the medium of all its municipalities.

In Switzerland, where the French language was spoken, Farel, returning from the valleys of Piedmont, appeared for the first time at Geneva in 1532, and began to preach the gospel in that city. Froment arrived there a few days after, and delivered his first public discourse in the open air in the *Place du Molard*, which at that time bordered the lake, on New-Year's Day 1533. Farel, in the middle of the same year, printed, at Neufchatel, his *first liturgy* of the newly-formed churches, and returned to Geneva to preach for the first time in the convent of Rive, in 1534; and, in August of the following year, 1535, the senate of the republic abolished the mass.

This was a reformation; it was soon to become a transformation. The following year, 1536, was marked by the arrival of Calvin, who was for twenty-nine years the most brilliant light of the churches that used the French language.

In Germany, Martin Luther, in 1520, burnt the bull of Leo X. and the *Decretals* in the public square at Wittemberg; four months after, in 1521, he made his appearance at the diet of Worms, before the emperor and all the princes of Germany; the same year, 1521, he began his translation of the New Testament, in the Castle of Wartburg, where the Elector had concealed him to save his life; he finished it on the third of March 1522; printed it in September 1522, and the whole Bible in 1530. The Augustin monks of Wittemberg had suppressed the low masses, and began to administer the cup to the laity, from 1522. By that time the free cities of Germany were converted; Frankfort-on-the-Maine one of the first. Bucer was converted in 1521, and very shortly after Strasburg with him; the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark in 1523; Prussia, under Albert of Brandenburg, in 1525. In the same year, 1525, John, the new Elector of Saxony, successor of his brother, Frederick the Wise, placed himself in the gap for the Reformation, and declared himself without reserve in favour of

Luther. Rome, says Mr Morrison, felt struck in h
The noble and pious Hamilton, a young man of roya
returning from his travels, preached the gospel in S
1528; and this man of charity and prayer, at the ea
twenty-four, underwent in the following year a cruel
martyrdom.

In 1529, the diet of Spire passed a decree against
rans, as they were called; and then the Elector of Br
and many princes of the empire who followed him, had t
to *protest*, and to form immediately, for their commo
the treaty of Smalcald.

The Brethren of Bohemia, and the Vaudois refugees in
had excited an increasing thirst for the milk of the V
the Scriptures made so rapid a progress in Transylv
before 1530 a very large number of churches were re
that distant country which had completely separated fr
The Bohemians, having united with the Swiss in their d
of faith, published their Confession in 1533.

Lastly, in the same year, 1533, the Parliament of Engla
a resolution which withdrew that powerful kingdom from
to the Pope.

Many princes of the Germanic Confederation followed,
mentioned, the noble example of the Elector. The six
the empire who signed that celebrated PROTESTATION
Elector of Saxony, the Marquis of Brandenburg, E
Francis, Dukes of Luneburg, the Landgrave of Hesse
Prince of Anhalt. The deputies of fourteen free citi
empire had the glory of joining in this evangelical d
tion; and henceforward those princes and cities were t
be distinguished, in the face of all Europe, by the noble
PROTESTANTS.

"We cannot study these proceedings," Mr Morrison
"without admiring their sublime character. It was the
of conscience over all worldly interests; it was an illus
ample of the courage with which the power of the M
invests His people when, with an honest and good h

[1] History of the Reformation; translated by Burnier, p. 144. Par

resolve to sacrifice everything in order to oppose that which is opposed to Him."

Such, then, in the work of the Reformation, was the rapid and irresistible progress which that Holy Word made in the world; and this is one of the marks which demonstrate, with the greatest evidence, that the cause was God's, and that the Lord operated then with His witnesses as in the days of the apostles,[1] "bearing testimony to the word of His grace by the signs which accompanied it." A single generation had been sufficient. The Bible, restored to the earth, had spread its beams like the rising sun; everywhere pious souls rejoiced in its light; and this light had not only rendered visible to all eyes the evils of the Church of Rome in their most hideous depths, and forced all men to acknowledge that this Church was corrupted in its head as well as in its members, but it had awakened their consciences, and powerfully moved their hearts, by revealing the free gifts of God. From that time, the truths of Christ and His Divine promises, being rendered evident as the light of day, responded to all the aspirations of the souls that thirsted after righteousness, that were the most sanctified and the most loving.

If the effects of the Holy Word at the Reformation were divinely rapid, they were also divinely holy; and this second feature attests more than all the rest the heavenly origin of that vast movement.

647. The men whom Divine grace had put at the head of this return to the sacred canon of the Scriptures were, in every country Christians of deep piety, of exemplary life, and of apostolic zeal; while, as to the great multitude that followed them out of all the nations of Europe, they were in general people whose sincerity, elevated views, and living faith were unquestionable; for it was in the path of self-denial, of suffering, and of humility, that they followed Jesus Christ. They thirsted after the Divine Word, and were ready to make every sacrifice for it. They had washed their robes in the blood of redemption. The objects they sought for, at any cost, were His truth, His peace, His life in their souls. They were not concerned merely to escape from the yoke of Rome, nor to protest against the errors of the priests; they thought not of

[1] Acts xiv. 3, 17.

their right but of their duties. They resolved to the [illegible] carrying their cross—acknowledging no [illegible] and but Him as their guide to other righteousness [illegible] name whereby they could be saved.

Like Abraham they quitted their country and their [illegible] their houses, their relations, and their goods, going forth [illegible] a foreign land a country possessed of the gospel, preferring [illegible] hardships of exile and poverty, priests reproach, and [illegible] to all the comforts of their former condition. How [illegible] might be seen arriving at the cities of refuge God had [illegible] them, despoiled of everything, harassed but yet happy [illegible] quitted all for Jesus Christ; and esteeming this wandering [illegible] with all its uncertainties, its humiliating circumstances [illegible] painful toils, as far happier and more valuable than all [illegible] sures of earth, because "they had respect to the recompense [illegible] reward," (Heb. xi. 26.) Like the Hebrews to whom St Paul [illegible] "they took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing [illegible] had in heaven a better and more enduring substance," Heb. [illegible] They might be seen in the different countries of the Reformation [illegible] passing through the trial of mockeries, of scourging, of bonds [illegible] imprisonment, "wandering about, destitute of all things, afflicted, [illegible] tormented: (of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered [illegible] in deserts and in mountains, and concealed themselves in dens and [illegible] caves of the earth," (Heb. xi. 37, 38;) dying by the sword, by [illegible] fire, or by strangulation, but dying with psalms, and hymns, and [illegible] prayers for their persecutors.

648. And let it be borne in mind that, in using this language, I [illegible] mean to speak only of the first generation which heard the [illegible] voice of the Reformation,—that generation which was first [illegible] by the brightness of the Holy Word, and which, having [illegible] to suffer for this recovered and proclaimed truth, constituted [illegible] first churches. I do not speak of the generations that [illegible] and which afterwards formed in different countries of Europe [illegible] under very different influences, our Protestant population.

A revival coming from God lasts only for one generation [illegible] — that is to say, for thirty or forty years, according to [illegible] been said by the illustrious Jonathan Edwards, the great [illegible] logian, probably, of modern times, who had such abunda[illegible]

of studying the subject. The divine phenomenon can be reproduced, no doubt, by fresh effusions of the Spirit; but then it is a new work. In proportion as the generation which has experienced it disappears by death, the phenomenon also disappears, and the generations that come after will gather only its indirect fruits by the natural influences of education and example. God can bless individually these means of grace to the children, but their effects will not have the same extent nor the same intensity as the revival itself; for the new birth "is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man;" it is of God, whose Spirit "bloweth where it listeth."

We must not, then, judge of what has been a religious revival by what the generations are that succeed it.

And it is not an exception to this rule that we have seen, in the religious history of Geneva, the remarkable and vital piety of that city perpetuated after the Reformation for 150 years. This singular fact is accounted for by the continual influx of refugees and martyrs, which year after year, for more than a century and a half, never ceased to flow thither.

649. Now if—to demonstrate the intervention of God in that Reformation which restored to the world the canon of Scripture—we give as an additional proof the eminent holiness which marked its effects throughout, in doing this we do not arbitrarily indulge our personal predilections. Very possibly they might be disputed, and we might be thought prejudiced. But we shall appeal to the most incontestible, the most exact, and the most authentic testimony. These men of the Reformation, "though dead, yet speak," (Heb. xi. 4;) we can follow them; we can listen to them in their life and in their last conflict; they still speak by their faith, their hope, and their love. I refer here to the *History of the Martyrs*, by Crespin, an inestimable book, and now very scarce; the most interesting monument which has been left us of the sixteenth century, the most noble of that incomparable epoch, and, I venture to say (having studied it attentively, and found it always tend to the edification of my soul and the confirmation of my faith) that, taken as a whole, it is the noblest monument of Christianity since the days of the apostles. It narrates, for sixty-nine years, the life, the doctrine, the heart and mind of the martyrs of the Refor-

mation, and you behold them in their sufferings and la
Far more familiar, more authentic, and more instructive th
has been left us as memorials of the first ages, or the narr
Eusebius respecting the martyrs of his times, or the
accounts of the death of St Ignatius, written by eye-witn
the beautiful letter from the church at Smyrna on the
Polycarp,—is this folio of more than 3000 pages. And
in it not only, as in the ancient writings I have just n
account of the heroic death of martyrs, but their exam
their answers at length, their confessions on all the points
their trials of various kinds, their familiar letters to th
who prayed for them, and sometimes the letters addressed
in their confinement by Christians, such as Calvin, Vir
and Beza, who held, at Geneva, or elsewhere, social mee
their behalf. You read in this volume their consolatio
trials, their devotions. Nothing could better exemplify t
of an epoch than such a volume as this; for you see the
in their doctrine, in their worship, in their habits of p
their brotherly union, and in their last conflict. It is
living picture of contemporary Christianity; it is the
genuous expression of their heroism and their sancti
follow them day by day, we appear with them before thei
we associate ourselves with their testimony, we suffer wi
we weep with them, we join our voices with their hymns
umph with them. In a word, it is the realisation of the
life of those times in the most energetic and devoted me
the Church; and it is impossible not to recognise in such
heroism the transcendent agency of the Holy Spirit. W
recommend too highly this rare work to every believer,
him that he will find there a continual and impressive
what it is to live in Jesus Christ.

650. The learned and pious Crespin, a friend of Ca
younger, was, like him, a refugee from France to Geneva
had already rendered himself useful to the churches by h
rous writings, when all the Christians of reformed Sw
were roused on the subject of the martyrdom of fiv
Frenchmen, students of theology, who had come to the
of Lausanne to prepare, under Theodore Beza, for the p

of the gospel. On returning to Lyons, they were seized, thrown into dungeons, subjected to the rudest tests, and at last condemned to be burnt to death. Their examinations, their noble confessions, their affecting letters sent daily to Geneva, suggested to Crespin the first thought of applying himself to that great work to which he consecrated the rest of his life. "My whole aim," he says in his preface, "has been to write the life, the doctrine, and the happy end of those who have furnished testimony of having sealed by their death the truth of the gospel."

The book reaches from the reign of Nero to the death of Henry III. of Valois in 1589. "And that no one may doubt," Crespin says in his preface, "of the fidelity which I have preserved in these collections, since God granted me the favour of sketching the first outlines, I have protested and still protest that I have endeavoured to write as succinctly and simply as possible what concerns the attacks made upon the churches. And as to writings and confessions, I have inserted nothing without the writen testimony of those who are dead, or without learning by word of mouth from those who have asked them, or without having extracts from public records, or without having seen faithful witnesses, or writings so well authenticated that they could not be contradicted. I have sometimes found obscure passages, as if written in dark places of concealment, and often with their blood, which the poor martyrs were obliged to use for want of ink. As to their examinations and answers, which have been some times taken from records, everything is generally so confused, and set down as suited the taste of ignorant or malicious clerks, that it was necessary to give a summary extract, preserving the substance of the questions and answers."

Crespin died full of days. Pious men sent to him at Geneva, from Belgium and Chambery, Italy and Turin, and from all the cities in France, everything they could discover relating to martyrs; and he consecrated his long life to collecting reverentially all these precious remains. He himself did not leave this world till 1587, twenty-three years later than Calvin. Yet, after his decease, the number of the martyrs having much increased, a pious and able man added fresh books to his collection, and Eustace Vignon, his son-in-law, published at Geneva, in 1608, first a

fourth edition, composed of ten books, and then a fifth, cont twelve.[1]

651. After having narrated in his first book the persec and martyrdoms of the fourteen first centuries, to the days great Wyckliffe, in 1371, in the second he narrates the suf of the witnesses of Jesus Christ who died for the truth fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the lamp of the gos the author says, had passed from the English to the Bohe and John Huss and Jerome of Prague made a stand again whole world at the great Council of Constance, then a great martyrdoms in France, England, Holland, Germany, an whom those of the first literary men of Meaux, who ha lightened France—Jacques Pavannes, Louis de Berquin, de Rieux, Castelain, Wolfgang, Schuch; next, in Scotland, I Hamilton, of royal blood; next, J. de Castuce, burnt at Tou Alexander Canus at Paris, and Jean Pointet at Savoy. "Th at this time," said Crespin, "the light increased in brig believers multiplied by great numbers in different places." thus he comes to his third book, which begins with the persecution that occurred at Paris in 1534, on the subject placards.

That furious storm, which caused such sufferings to nu of believers in that city, was of advantage not only to othe in France, but to foreign countries. "Geneva," he says, "d advantage from the excellent persons whom God withdrew t to open afterwards the great school for His people. That he says, "saw in the same year, 1535, by the martyrdom of Goudet, burnt at a slow fire by the Peneysans,[2] what would been done to the whole city if the adherents of its bishc gained the upper hand."

The Vaudois endured unspeakable sufferings. You see th of the Spanish inquisitors in the death of Roch of Brabant, the death of many martyrs burnt at Tournay. You see al

[1] We might have cited in the same manner the interesting English mart of John Foxe in 1563. This writer died in London at the age of seven had educated the Duke of Norfolk. His son, it is said, republished his ac collection in 1634, in folio.

[2] The inhabitants of a fortified village which belonged to the bishop party.

admirable fruits of the labours of Peter Brully, French pastor at Strasburg, when visiting the Low Countries. You have, again, the persecution of Metz, visited by Farel, as well as the afflictions of Flanders and Hainaut.

The fourth book begins with the fourteen martyrs of Meaux. You see in England the fury of Henry VIII. falling on the noblest persons in his realm. In France, Dauphiny, Normandy, Burgundy, L'Auvergne, Limages, La Touraine, present, in turn, bloody witnesses of the grace which is in Jesus Christ. In the Low Countries there are also some eminent martyrs. In vain the parliaments of Dijon, Chambery, exert themselves to stifle the doctrine of the gospel. In vain Canino and Casanove are put to death in Italy; the gospel will continue to spread more and more. Here again appear the five students of Lausanne burnt at Lyons; their noble confession, their admirable martyrdom.

The fifth book is devoted entirely to the horrible persecutions which followed in England the accession of Mary, who re-established throughout her kingdom the service of the mass and image-worship. During the same period the fires of martyrdom were kept burning in all parts of France.

The sixth book opens with a beautiful and affecting spectacle. Five respectable men setting out from Geneva to make use of the admirable gifts God had imparted to them are stopped on their road towards the valleys of Piedmont and taken to Chambery. There they sealed with their blood their doctrine, and the precious writings that were taken from their prison.

"The diversity of nations and of minds," Crespin remarks, "excites our admiration of one effect of the Divine agency—namely, the holy harmony of doctrine which was everywhere seen to be gloriously maintained among the Lord's witnesses of every country and of every rank." Besides the English, who appear here in great numbers, you see learned men of Italy; brethren of the Low Countries executed at Malines; some English bishops, true bishops, such as Glover, Ridley, Latimer, Philpot, Cranmer the primate of England, and other personages equally attached to the glory of the Son of God, and all rendering the same testimony even unto death.

The seventh book is full of a variety which renders the work of God in reference to His people more striking. A great number of

believers of every rank in France and in England are see their blood under the most cruel punishments, and no the doctrine of salvation. The Low Countries, Champag Normandy, Touraine, Angoulême, Poitou, in like manne heroic examples of believers in their respective provinces; light," Crespin here remarks, "spread so far by the preac gospel that it reached as far as Brazil in America, a cou discovered, which, as soon as the truth made itself heard watered also by the blood of martyrs."

Spain in its turn came to be winnowed by dreadful pe and the tragical misdeeds of the Inquisition are here This horrible institution was on the point of being intro France, and yet, in spite of the plots of their most mal versaries, the assemblies of believers in that country daily. It was then that, in spite of all obstacles, and in of dreadful tempests, an invincible power, fortifying so number of martyrs, the truth advanced, and the pa faithful deputies of the churches, met in 1559 in Paris i by the light of funeral piles, to publish their confession and the articles of their ecclesiastical discipline. Th death of King Henry II. suddenly dispersed the sche conspiracy by which it was proposed to exterminate a formed. The parliaments, astonished at the multitude of seemed to moderate their fury, but very soon Anne du member of the parliament, had to shew by his courage the holiness of the cause he had so nobly defended.

Then the eighth book, the last that Crespin wrote hi which ends in 1562, two years before Calvin's death, des dreadful sufferings of the faithful in the different pro France. The miserable state of Poland, Belgium, and also briefly exhibited.

652. We must follow during the long years which the tion includes in Crespin's narrative, this multitude of ever persecuted, thrown into prisons, condemned to the flames, for Jesus Christ, if we wish to form a just idea of the holin for such a length of time characterised this vast movemer patience! what charity! what heroic gentleness! what faith! Above all, we must see this powerful people of th

Reformed Church, persecuted, deprived of their property, deceived, betrayed, tracked, slain in the very act of worship, like sheep led to the slaughter; or obliged to leave the kingdom, thrown into prisons at the instance of the priests, given up to tribunals, loaded with insults, and burnt alive in public places, without their patience and gentleness being disturbed, and without their being reproached in any province, during forty years, with a single act of resistance or revolt. What power then restrained this great French people? It was not the fear of man. In many places the Reformed were in the majority; they were trained to arms; they had in their ranks the better half of the nobility, the choicest part of the military, the most illustrious captains of the age. What restrained them for forty years was holiness; it was the fear, not of man, but of God; it was reverence for His written Word, which forbade Christians to rebel against "the powers that be," even those of a Nero. Let us not forget that thirty-five years passed from the cruel and affecting punishment of John le Clerc at Meaux in 1524 to that of the noble counsellor Anne de Bourg, whom the king caused to be strangled and burnt for the sole fact of his having respectfully but nobly avowed before him that he was a partisan of the persecuted faith. I know not if in all history we can find a more singular and beautiful spectacle than these five-and-thirty years of Christian long-suffering and gentleness among a whole people. Certainly, for any one who knows this nation, such heroism, so long, so patient, and so humble, cannot be explained but by the influence of the Holy Spirit and of the written Word upon the 2150 churches of which that great people of the French Reformed then consisted.[1]

653. But in the effects of the Reformation, which the sacred canon of the Scriptures gave to the world, what above all shews the Divine agency, is not only their extent, nor the rapidity of their progress, nor their admirable holiness; it is rather, as we have said, their marvellous unity.

Everywhere you see these new men come forth from the same

[1] According to an official return, besides the churches *planted*, of which the number is unknown, the number of regularly constituted churches (*églises dressées*) in 1561 amounted to 2150. (See Leitteroth, Réformation en France, Paris, 1859, p. 131.)

school; all have for their instructors only the written Word and the Holy Spirit; all are of the same family, and children of the same Father; they have the same elder Brother—He who in heaven "is not ashamed to call them brethren." In Transylvania, in Poland, in Sweden, in Denmark, in Germany, as in Scotland or in England, or in Holland or in France; at Bâle, at Berne, at Geneva, as in Spain or in Italy—everywhere, if you examine what the Holy Word, when brought again to light, produced in the souls of these martyrs, you will be struck with admiration; for always, and in every quarter, you hear the same language. There is the same faith, the same sensibility, the same experiences, the same adoration. Everywhere there is the same Saviour, saving sinners by the same free grace, without any other price than His blood, without any other merit than His merits, without any other hand for laying hold of this grace but the hand of faith, without any other condition but of receiving it without condition, with no other guide, no other mediator, no other priest than Jesus Christ received into the heart by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

654. To establish this interesting fact, I would say, Read the conflict and the end of each of these thousand martyrs. But perhaps I shall make it more clear and impressive by appealing to another monument of the Reformation—one of the most admirable, and most worthy of being studied. I refer to the harmonious collection of the "Thirteen great Confessions of Faith," which the restoration of the Scriptures in Europe caused to be solemnly published in the most distant and different countries. There was not, first of all, any concert between one nation and another; all were separately made, and under the most agitated state of things; yet you will be obliged to admire their holy agreement. Different collections of them have been published, better to shew their majestic unity; but we prefer citing here one of the most approved, published at Geneva in 1612, and entitled, "The Body of the Confessions of Faith," which, authentically drawn up in different kingdoms, nations, or republics of Europe, in the name of their churches, were at last presented in the most celebrated assemblies, and sanctioned by public authority.[1]

[1] Sennebier, Hist. Littér. de Genève, ii., 26:—"Corpus et syntagnia CONFESSIONUM FIDEI quae in diversis regnis et nationibus, Ecclesiarum nomine, fuerunt

We have here, then, not the writing of a particular author,—it is the voice of the Reformation making itself solemnly heard by all nations, through the great bodies of the church which represent it. It is the Reformed body asking audience of the whole world.

You will be able, then, to see in detail, in the thirteen principal confessions, which are as follow, the admirable and powerful agreement of which we speak:—

655. There is, first of all, the celebrated Helvetic Confession. A former Swiss Confession had already been made at Bâle, in German, in 1532. (It was adopted later by the civic authorities of Mulhausen.) But, in 1536, the so-called Helvetic Confession was made first of all at Bâle, at the request of the senate of that republic, who had convoked the evangelical cities of Switzerland, for the object of agreeing with them in an exposition of their common faith. The cities, therefore, sent to Bâle their most respected magistrates, with Henry Bullinger, Oswald Myconius, and Simon Gryneus, doctors of Zurich and Bâle, who had also taken care to send for Bucer and Capito from Strasburg, that they might concur in preparing the document, and thus better attest the holy agreement of the churches.

Their work was approved in their respective States; it even received the approbation of the theologians of Wittemberg, and that of Luther.

But subsequently, this Confession, drawn up with greater fulness, was published in 1566, and received the successive adhesion of the churches of Zurich, Bienne, Schaffhausen, St Gall, the Grisons, Mulhausen, Bienne, and Geneva; and, later still, the public and official approbation of the churches of England, Scotland, France, Belgium, Poland, Hungary, and a great number of the German churches.

2. The Confession of the Churches of France, drawn up at Paris by a national synod, secretly assembled in the midst of the most terrible persecutions. Two years later, Theodore Beza, in the name of the churches of France, presented it solemnly to King Charles IX., in the conference of Poissy. Afterwards read at the national synod of Rochelle in 1571, three copies of it were care-

authentice editae, in celeberrimis conventibus exhibitae, publicâque auctoritate comprobatae."

fully made on parchment, which received the signatures, with their own hand, of the Queen of Navarre, Henry of Navarre, her young son, Henry of Condé, Louis of Nassau, Admiral Coligny, as well as all the pastors or elders deputed to the synod by all the churches of the provinces of France.

One of the three copies was sent to Geneva, and is deposited in the archives of that city.

3. The celebrated Confession of the Anglican Church, accepted by the synod of London in 1562. It was amended and printed in 1571.

4. The Confession of Scotland, framed in 1568, was subscribed in parliament by all the estates of the realm in 1580.

5. The Belgian Confession, written the first time in French in the year 1561, to express the common faith of the churches in Flanders, Artois, and Hainaut, which were then suffering such cruel persecutions. It was confirmed in 1579 by a Belgian synod.

6. The Polish Confession, presented and proclaimed by common consent in the synod of Zamosc, (*in synodo Czengerina,*) and printed at Debreczin in 1570.

7. The Confession of the Four Imperial Cities, namely, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, written in 1538, and presented to the Emperor Charles V. by the deputies of those four cities, at the same time that the Confession of Augsburg was presented to him.

8. The celebrated Confession of Augsburg in 1530, drawn up on the spot, Philip Melancthon the writer tells us, while the diet held its sittings in that city. It was presented to the emperor by some of the most illustrious princes of Germany. It was acknowledged afterwards, and presented afresh to the Emperor Ferdinand in 1558 and 1561.

9. The Saxony Confession in 1551.

10. The Wurtemberg Confession, presented to the Council of Trent in 1552 by the deputies of the Duke of Wurtemberg.

11. The Confession of the Elector Palatine.

12. The Confession of the Bohemian Church, and of the Vaudois refugees from Piedmont in a foreign land. This is one of the most ancient. Approved publicly by Luther and Melancthon in 1532, and by the Academy of Wittemberg, it was at last adopted

by the free barons of the kingdom of Bohemia, and the rest of the nobility, and presented in 1535 to King Ferdinand.

13. Lastly, The general Consensus passed in the assembly at Thorn, by the Polish churches of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and of Great and Little Poland.

656. Let it suffice us to have pointed out these thirteen confessions, and the remarkable books which, by bringing them together, only make us admire the unity that exists amidst the diversity. "It is a good thing," said Augustin, "to have many orthodox expositions of Holy Scripture, expressed in different terms, provided they agree in the same faith; for this diversity serves for the better understanding of the truth, since it is not contrary to it."[1]

Thus, while that admirable unity of the people of God in their faith is exhibited in so beautiful and affecting a manner, by the innumerable martyrs of the Reformation, summoned apart before their judges and executioners, and yet all giving the same testimony either in the dungeon or on the scaffold; it is also a beautiful spectacle to see it also proclaimed by the synods, and on the most solemn occasions by whole churches, and by their most eminent doctors.

657. But we have said enough to shew the hand of God in that great dispensation which, after nine centuries of obscurity, restored to the world the sacred canon of the Scriptures. Everything, in fact, reveals that hand; the inveterate greatness of the obstacles—the extreme feebleness of the means—the unparalleled nature of the effects—their suddenness, their rapid and powerful progress, their extent, their action on nations, and on consciences—their singular holiness, and their magnificent unity.

It now only remains to speak of the last intervention of Providence, and the splendid testimony it bears to the canon of the Scriptures.

This is perhaps the most remarkable of the three dispensations, though it appeared at the dawn of the nineteenth century, without noise or previous expectation,—rising like another sun upon the world, to enlighten it with a new light, and, in a short time, to

[1] De Doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. ii. "Illa diversitas plus adjuvat, quam impedit intelligentiam, si modo legentes non sint negligentes."

enrich the most distant nations with the beneficent fruits c agency.

Moreover, there is this great point of superiority in this pensation to the preceding ones—that while they gave to the c only a collective testimony, splendid and valuable, no doub indistinct, this of which we are about to speak refers disti exclusively, and by name, to each of the twenty-seven books c New Testament, as well as to each of the thirty-nine books compose the Old Testament. All our readers will understanc we are here speaking of the great institution of the BIBLE Soc the wonder of this age—an institution without parallel f magnitude—oecumenical and fraternal, generous and powe carrying the everlasting gospel over the whole earth, accompli in silence such great things, while it quietly prepares, as we said, for greater things.

SECTION THIRD.

THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

658. *Fact the Fourteenth.*—The Bible Society appeared c earth when no one expected it, in order to begin an entirel era of universal evangelisation.

In rapidly reviewing its first operations, and comparing with what God has caused it to become, we hope we shall all our readers comprehend how much the hand of the Lor been revealed in this wonderful creation; so that every one better estimate the full force and extent of the testimony this institution bears among all nations, and in all the lang of mankind, to the sacred canon of the Scriptures.

659. It would be interesting to recall the humble circumst of its birth, when the first conception of a Bible Society enter heart of Mr Charles, the minister of Bala, while that apostolic was exercising his ministry among the poor inhabitants of W but these details are so well known in England, and especial recent works on the subject, that we omit them in this t lation.

660. On March 7, 1804, the very year when, in France, N leon I. seized the imperial sceptre, and when in Englan

men seemed occupied only with his threatened invasion, and with victorious conflicts by land and sea, this important institution, destined to effect such great things in the kingdom of God, was constituted in London, unostentatiously, before an assembly of 300 persons, mostly Dissenters.[1]

661. The society thus formed seemed at first like an obscure and weakly infant, for nothing could be more unpretending than its birthplace and its first friends. But God, who intended to make it one of the most powerful instruments of His mercy for the whole earth, was pleased, as usual, to render His agency more manifest, by the very lowliness of its beginning. Whenever He prepares great things for His Church, He takes care to keep back at first the powerful and the influential of this world, that all the honour of what is done may redound to Himself alone. Moses was taken from the river in an ark of bulrushes, and when an angel came to announce to men a Deliverer as far superior to Moses as the Creator to the creature, "Behold!" He said, "this shall be a sign unto you: you shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger," (Luke ii. 12.)

Around the cradle of the Bible Society were found at first none of the great ones of the earth, because God had in reserve for it the highest destinies.

The same year in which Pope Pius VII. came to Paris to inaugurate the first Bonaparte with so much pomp in Notre Dame, a few private persons met at the London Tavern to inaugurate an association destined to produce to the very ends of the earth results a thousand times superior—I do not say only in duration, nor only in excellence, but in grandeur—to all the traces that extraordinary man was able to leave behind of his genius and his victories.

On the 7th of March 1804, at the inauguration of the society, not a single influential person either in the State or the Church was present; the only Episcopal minister who had condescended, though with reluctance, to attend, the Rev. John Owen, tells us himself the astonishment and uneasiness he felt at first, when he found himself seated near three Quakers, so novel at that

[1] The Book and its Story, pp. 217–238. Owen's History of the First Ten Years of the Bible Society.

time were such associations. But the excellent Owen cou
afford to make these confessions, after the zeal he had
displayed in this holy cause, and the eminent services
rendered it.[1]

662. Yet nothing can better shew the divine hand
institution, as God made it, than to consider what mei
wished to make it.

By a divine arrangement, this infant, so obscure and
its first entrance into the world, but for which, without t
had the charge of it being aware, so grand a future was
by God—this infant received into its constitution an
and laws of existence in pre-established harmony with its
destiny. This society, as men at first planned it, would
neither the aim, nor the mode, nor the simplicity, nor t
licity, nor the grandeur which have characterised it; a
we consider the long-cherished prejudices of church
which had preceded its birth, we venture to say that
would have been equal to conceiving a plan at once so si
so magnificent. This great epoch, which we venture to
biblical era in the history of the Church, really inaug
period altogether novel of fraternal breadth and true ca
so that, in the unthought-of manner in which it was forr
once revealed to us that it was of God as its immense
tinual progress will very soon shew us.

Let us now state its constitution; let us also state its
progress; and we shall then be in a position to appre
value of the testimony it renders at the present day i
languages of mankind to the sacred canon of the Scriptu

663. What is its constitution? The British and Forei
Society exists only to spread among all nations, and to
of the earth, one book, the written Word of God in the
New Testaments.

It prints and circulates it without any note, explan
comment.[2]

It delivers it pure from all human alloy; it admits
cryphal book; and when it gives it to societies on the c

[1] The Book and its Story. London, 1854, p. 229, &c.

[2] Excepting the various readings of the text and of the translat

it takes care not to deliver it into their hands till it is bound, that there may be no temptation anywhere to associate any other book with the oracles of God.

It gives the written Word in all the languages of mankind, making use, as far as possible, of the most faithful and accredited versions.

Where versions are wanting, it seeks to obtain them, and for this end contributes by donations, directly or indirectly.

The Bible Society, as a society, belongs to no particular Church, to no section of the universal Church, to no party.

From its birth, in order to maintain its catholicity, and to be of service to all men who search the Scriptures, it was placed under the direction of a large committee, composed of thirty-six laymen, taken from every denomination of Christians. Six of these members must be chosen from foreigners who reside in London or its neighbourhood, half of the remaining must belong to the Church of England, the other to Dissenting churches. This is still its constitution, and it is striking to see how, from that day, this creation of so novel a kind has inaugurated for our age, and for the majority of our existing churches, a new era of true catholicity, of fraternal association, and of evangelical alliance.

It has been better than ever before understood that, beyond the distinctions, often too stringent, of our ecclesiastical denominations, there exists before God a holy and universal Church of all the true worshippers of Jesus Christ.

The committee, which meets regularly on the first Monday in every month, is composed, we have said, of laymen; but to complete the description of its government, we must add this clause, that every minister of whatever church, if he is a member of the society by his annual subscription, has a right to take a part every month in the deliberations of the committee, and even to give his vote. Moreover, the British and Foreign Bible Society accepts the co-operation of every other society, at home or abroad, which is disposed to pursue the same object under the same conditions.

Its grants to societies on the European Continent have always been liberal. They were remarkably so during the first ten years of its existence narrated by Owen. For before the end of the terrible wars of England against Napoleon, forty-eight independent

Bible societies in Germany, Hungary, Sweden, and Swit
in Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Courland, and Russia, had
from its generosity 99,000 Bibles and 127,000 New Testa

And if the society, thus associated in all regions of th
with so many thousand societies of the same kind, may
sidered as forming an imposing body of which it is the mo
head, it has always been without domineering, or being
sible for their acts. It has never pretended to put itself
head of this vast union; it maintains with these ten th
associations only the relations of holy co-operation and C
brotherhood.

Lastly, The society has never received and never sought
of any government. It has never conveyed its agents or its
on board government vessels,—it has had no transactions
great powers of this world, and never has had the thought
ing by the sale of its books; for the entire receipts it has
from that quarter has not amounted to one-half of its
And to carry on its liberal donations to so many other soci
draws from the offerings of piety, of rich and poor, but
from the latter. It has but one object, the extensive circul
the Scriptures. This is all its gain.

We see, then, what it is. Let me shew, in few words,
has done, or rather what God has done by it, silently, for
century.

To give an idea of the progress of its work all over the
we shall attempt to shew the measure of it, by some fac
figures taken from its last report.

664. During these fifty-six years of daily increasing labo
British and Foreign Bible Society has caused the Scriptures
printed and circulated in 188 versions.

It has caused them to be translated, printed, and circul
158 different languages or dialects spoken among men.

Of these 158 different languages in which the Bible Socie
caused the Scriptures to be translated, printed, bound, a
culated, for 109 it has charged itself *directly* with all the ex
and for the 49 others, *indirectly* by donations and grants t
societies. For example, by supporting for a time missi
who left provisionally to their colleagues their daily task o

nary ministration, to give themselves to the labour of a first translation of the Scriptures among people who never before possessed them.

Among these 158 languages in which the Bible Society has caused the oracles of God to be translated, printed, and circulated, 138 had never before been reduced to a written language.

Thus, then, during this half century alone so many new tribes, almost unknown to geography, but now evangelised, see their happy children come from the missionary schools with the Holy Word in their hands! They knew nothing of the wonders of reading, and of the printing press,—they had never seen books; and usually, like the father of king Moshesh among the Bassutos, they would have said to the missionary who brought them, under the form of a sacred volume, the good news of the grace of God, "No; I can never believe that a black can be clever enough to make paper speak. A lie all this!—a lie! No one can make me believe that the word of man can become visible!" [1]

665. To give a single example of the labour which must be undergone on behalf of each of these 138 tribes, it is sufficient to call to mind what was done for their most ancient station, the interesting island of Tahiti. In 1796, eight years before the formation of the Bible Society, the first English missionaries on board the *Duff* landed on this island. After sixteen year's hard labour they had gained nothing; and it was only in the twenty-fourth year that the first-fruits clearly shewed themselves. In 1820, two Tahitan domestics, who had met to pray together, had succeeded in assembling round them, during the absence of the missionaries, a group of islanders desirous of seeking God, and longing after Him. "The spirit of grace and of supplication" at last descended on this people. Then the society hastened to supply these rising churches with three thousand copies of Luke's Gospel in Tahitan, and soon after with ten thousand copies of the other Gospels and the Book of Acts. Schools multiplied, and the people advanced in the knowledge of God, until at last, in 1830, the whole New Testament could be supplied to them; and, in 1838, the Old Testament was printed for them under the superintendence of the venerable missionary Notts, who had resided in

[1] Casalis, Bassutos, pp. 86, 88, 118.

these islands for forty years. These two books were so
sought for by the natives that they paid two dollars for the
in order to purchase them, engaged in distant fisheries.
after forty-two years, the whole Bible was at last gained f
people. "It is delightful," the missionaries wrote in 184
see their ardent thirst for the Holy Book. When they
obtained it, they leap for joy, they kiss it, and press it t
heart." Alas! that this treasure should so soon become
precious to them than they ever imagined.

It became, two years later, their consolation and their saf
against the attacks of the Jesuits, and the long oppression
French Protectorate. It was on the night of the 9th of Sep
1843, that the Admiral Du Petit Thouars forced the unfo
queen on board his vessel to sign the act of submission. B
wonderful it is that, in the seventeen years that followed, t
session of the Bible rendered this little people constantly f
their faith, and inflexible against all that was done to frigh
to seduce them, since they had been separated from their I
missionaries![1]

And what the society has effected in these islands, it has
repeat among the 137 other tribes to whom it has carri
Scriptures.

Thus, then, as of late it has often been remarked, we m
that, by the sole fact of these pious labours, the Bible Socie
the missionaries associated with it, have more enriched lit
during the last fifty years, than all the voyagers, philosophe
linguists have done since the beginning of the world, whet
to the acquisition of new languages, or to the intercourse of r
with one another.

But it is our intention to exhibit its rapid and beneficen
gress from another point of view; and for this purpose we
present other figures, which will enable us better to appreci
both as to the propagation of the knowledge of God, and
testimony it has rendered all over the earth to the canon
Scriptures. We take these details from its Fifty-sixth A
Report, which reaches to March 31, 1860.

666. During the year its receipts amounted to £164,136, 6

[1] The Book and its Story, pp. 408, 409. London, 1854.

in subscriptions, donations, and legacies, to £80,526, 1s. 6d.; in receipts for the sale of books, £81,493, 15s. 11d.

It has expended more than £179,000. It has distributed more than two million copies of the Scriptures.[1]

667. We may judge better of its most recent successes, and the increasing magnitude of its operations, if we say that this year its receipts have exceeded those of the preceding by more than £11,000—its expenses by more than £25,000; if we say also that the society, which, in commencing its operations, found only fifty languages employed in versions of the Holy Scriptures, offers in the present day, as we have just said, 188 versions in 158 different languages; if we say, again, that during the five first years of its existence its distribution of the Scriptures amounted in all to 159,459 copies, while during the five last they have been fifty-one times greater—that is to say, more exactly, 8,038,321 copies.

And, lastly, if we add that it has distributed altogether since its foundation thirty-seven millions and a half copies of the Holy Scriptures,[2] and that it has expended during the same period nearly £5,000,000.

668. But we may give in figures another most striking measure of its progress—namely, the number of auxiliary Bible societies which it has formed by its example, and its grants in every land where the Word of God is honoured.

Among these thousands of associations there are some which, on account of their development and their labours, it will be necessary to mention apart.

The object of all these is the same as its own; but what distinguishes the parent society is the splendour of its example, combined with the grandeur and generosity of its operations, for among all these thousands of societies we know not one which it has not richly assisted by its grants.

Since March 7, 1804, it has associated to itself more than 5000, without reckoning the 4200 auxiliary associations of the United States, nor all those that were formed in Russia around the great Russian Society during the thirteen years of its existence.

The British and Foreign Bible Society counts, then, in Great

[1] Including the circulation in India. [2] Exactly 37,527,827.

Britain 3672 auxiliaries; in the Colonies, 877; and in the ot British possessions, 453,—in all 5002.

669. But there are many others which we will content ourse with simply mentioning.

The Hibernian and the Edinburgh Society; the French Soci which, since its formation, has received from the British Foreign Bible Society 4,000,603 copies;[1] and many others Germany, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Sweden, W emberg, and the Hanseatic towns. There is not one of the I testant cantons of Switzerland which has not received generous grants. Bâle alone has received more than 442, copies of the Scriptures. And there are two more socie which must be mentioned separately.

670. The Russian, which had its bright days that may yet ret began in Finland in 1812, and in the following year was fully con tuted at St Petersburg by an imperial ukase. It has translated Scriptures into seventeen languages, in which they had never b known before. It has printed them in thirty different languag it has circulated them in forty-five. In 1806, among the Russi there was not one man in a thousand who could read the Sc tures, and one must have travelled hundreds of versts to fin Bible; whilst, on the seventh anniversary of the Russian Soci Prince Galitzin described the ardour with which, even as far Siberia and the Caucasian regions, the friends of the Holy W were employed in translating it into the different dialects of country.

But what an ukase of Alexander had authorised in 1813, other ukase of Nicholas abolished in 1826, and the society cea to exist!

During its short and beneficent existence it had procured Russia, in the Russian language, the New Testament, the Psal and the eight first books of the Old Testament. It had prin 324,000 copies of them; and, in the space of ten years, it had d tributed 800,000 volumes.

671. The other Bible Society, which yields in importance o to the British and Foreign Bible Society, is that of the Uni States.

[1] *Archives du Christianisme*, du 30th Avril, 1860.

In 1854, at the jubilee of the British Society, its deputies declared that they counted 1400 auxiliary societies, and 2800 branch associations.

672. Neither the Church nor the world has ever seen anything comparable to the Bible Society for its universality and its grandeur. It is a majestic river, which has never ceased to increase, noiselessly, like the tides of the ocean, and which will increase until the times shall be accomplished, and "all the ends of the earth shall have seen the salvation of our God." If this giant is to-day, as we have said, fifty-one times greater than he was in 1809, five years after his birth, what will he not be in forty-four years, at the next jubilee? And if, during this single half century, he has carried the Scriptures in 138 new languages among 138 new tribes of mankind, to how many other unknown nations will he have given them in fifty years more?

The pacific and powerful formation of this society is, then, an event of incomparable grandeur. It is the most important fact of the nineteenth century; everything conspires to shew the hand of God in it; everything tells us that He has prepared in this, His most powerful instrument for accomplishing the promised day, when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea," (Is. xi. 9.)

673. Are evangelical Christians, then, deceived, when they recognise in this great and beneficent institution the angel whom St John, during the visions of Patmos, beheld "flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach it unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people?" "Fear God," he said with a loud voice, "and give glory unto him, for the hour of his judgment is come," (Rev. xiv. 6–8.)

But our main object in tracing the progress of this institution was to recognise in it another manifestation of God's watching over His written Word. We had therefore to shew that it came from on high, and with what constancy and with what fulness it bears the most splendid and absolute testimony to all the books of our canon.

674. Truly we may say that here is the historical triumph of the canon.

We are asked what are the sacred books of the Old Testament, and what are the books that ought to be excluded.

We are asked at the same time what are the inspired books of the New Testament.

Behold, as if to answer in the name of the universal Church, this twofold question, there arises on earth at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a holy, gigantic, powerful association, such as the Church had never before seen, comprising, without distinction of sect, all classes of Christians who reverence the Scriptures, and proposing, for the only end of its existence, to circulate their true canon in all the languages of men to the very ends of the earth.

Listen to it then, for it has every right to be heard. It labours for fifty years; it has more than ten thousand societies like itself, which assist it in its work; it has distributed in the two hemispheres more than fifty millions of the Sacred Volume in fifty-eight different languages of men, and it has girded up its loins not to cease its distributions of the canon till "all the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Certainly it can be said of no other body than of this one, that it legitimately represents the Christian mind on this grand question. It is for all nations what the Amphictyonic Council was formerly among the Greeks, to whom the twelve Hellenic nations committed the charge of their temples. The Bible Society, the Amphictyonic Council of Christendom, appointed to guard the temple of the Scriptures, watches that nothing sacred shall be taken from it, and that nothing impure shall be admitted. Listen to it then.

675. First of all, as to the Old Testament, what is its first testimony?

It sends over the whole earth the oracles of the Old Testament such as they have always been acknowledged by the Jews, and such as they were always received and cited by Jesus and His apostles. Here are the twenty-two books as the Jewish doctors and their historians, and the ancient fathers of the Church counted them,[1]—not one more—not one less,—and it sends them

[1] Propp. 59, 434.

everywhere without any note, without any comment, without any Apocrypha, without any uninspired book.

In the thirty-seven millions of the Sacred Volume which England has circulated, and in the thirteen millions and a half which our American brethren have distributed, no Apocrypha has been inserted.

On the contrary, as the Amphictyonic Council of Christendom, and as appointed to guard the temple, they have cast out into the outer court these human books as unworthy of a place there, as Nehemiah cast out the "household stuff" of Tobiah, (Nehem. xiii. 7–9.)

But mark it well; this fidelity of the Bible Society in reference to the Apocrypha was not its own, but came of God, who watched over it almost in spite of itself.

In fact, till 1812, they had never given any part of the Apocrypha, but at that time their connexion with the relaxed churches on the Continent, and their desire to induce the Romanists not to refuse their Bibles, led them by degrees to descend to arrangements, in order to gain them.[1] Without even printing the Apocrypha in England, they allowed themselves in 1821, silently to permit their insertion in a Bible printed at Toulouse, and later, in 1824, at the request of a Roman Catholic priest, in an edition which was printed at their expense in Germany, for the German Romanists. It was an ill-judged compliance, of which they did not at first perceive all the evil, and they only allowed it on the Continent in the deceptive hope of gaining some souls to the reading of the Bible. This was to do evil that good might come; the evil of profaning the Book of God by the introduction of false books; and the evil, not less great, of presenting themselves to the world, as if they called in question the authenticity of the Oracles of God, their canon, and their integrity. But in 1824 the goodness of God raised up in Scotland, to lead them back into the right way, eminent and faithful men,[2] who reproved the society to the face, as

[1] Lives of Robert and James Haldane; London, 1852, p. 513.

[2] Among others, Dr Andrew Thomson, one of the greatest men of his time, possessing a colossal mind; but, still more, the faithful Robert Haldane, that man of God, to whom Geneva owes an eternal debt of gratitude for the admirable work he accomplished among the students in theology. He converted almost all of them to Jesus Christ by his powerful biblical instructions and his prayers.

Paul at Antioch, and for a very similar reason, "withstoo
because he was to be blamed," (Gal. ii. 11,) and becaus
weakness he greatly endangered the interests of the truth.

Thus these faithful men led the Bible Society back i
right path, as Paul led back the apostle Peter, and brou
declare aloud, that henceforward it should withhold all g
societies which joined the Apocrypha to the Sacred Volum
controversy, which lasted twelve years, was very benefici
respects. By the issue to which God brought it, it was
Bible Society a restoration; for the cause of the canon, a
mation; for all Christians, a lesson of uprightness, and
occasion for adoring the Providence that watched over the
Word, and that for thirty-three centuries has maintained, f
to age, and by various ways, the integrity of its canon.

Such then, as regards the Old Testament, is the im
testimony rendered by the Bible Society to the canon;
regards the New Testament, its answer is still more sim
more significant.

676. We are asked to state what is the mind of the Ch
this canon after 1800 years of its existence.

To reply, we have had for half a century an advantag
our predecessors never had. This great Society, with its
of ten thousand societies freely formed in both hemisph
unanimous; it is so in every language; it is so all over th
it has never ceased to be so; and since its birth it has dist
more than fifty millions of sacred copies, always in harmony
important point. Preceding ages have seen nothing like
this encouragement was reserved by the goodness of God
days; because all are arrived at the age of missions. How
indeed, is this fact suited to confirm our faith! How lum
does it shew us that God makes the same use of the C
people for the testimony to His Scriptures, which He ha
for three thousand years of the Jewish people, good or ba
so striking an invariableness!

May we not say of the Bible Society, and of its ten th
sister societies in the two hemispheres, that they are, as
the *comitia* of the whole Christian world, and give us its ju
on the important question of the Scriptures, as the *comitia*

Campus Martius did for the great affairs of the Roman people assembled by curial, by centuries, or by tribes? What does this great body everwhere attest? It has but one and the same answer all over the earth; you never hear a single discordant voice in the ten thousand societies; never has a single page varied in its fifty millions of volumes.

"THE SACRED CANON," it answers, "IS COMPOSED OF TWENTY-SEVEN BOOKS, AND THEY ARE THE FOLLOWING:—

"THE FOUR GOSPELS, THE BOOK OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, THE FOURTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL, THE SEVEN EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER, JOHN, AND JUDE, AND THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST TO HIS SERVANT JOHN."

This answer, we have said, is given by the representatives of the Christian world without one dissenting voice on its greatest affair, on the inspired Scriptures, on the books which the Christian Church must regard as the Word of God.

677. No doubt it will be here objected, that what we are pleased to call the *comitia* of the Christian world,—far from speaking on the part of all Christendom,—represents, after all, only the churches of every name where the use of the Holy Scripture is honoured; while, on the contrary, another moiety of Christendom marches under the orders of the Roman Pontiff, who, since the birth of the Bible Society, has always made it his first care, at the beginning of each reign, to anathematise it solemnly as the work of Satan.

It is true, we reply, that they have all anathematised it; Leo XII. in 1823, Pius VIII. in 1829, Gregory XVI. in 1831, and Pius IX. in 1848. But this fact only renders the unanimity of all the representatives of the Christian world more striking as regards the canon of the New Testament.

For while the *comitia* attest, on the question of the canon, the admirable unanimity of all Christian people where the use of the written Word is honoured, we are not ignorant at the same time that all these very popes and all their adherents HAVE FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT THE SAME CANON AS OURSELVES.

They vote therefore with the *comitia*.

They do not anathematise the societies for having a false canon; but only for the act of circulating the true canon indiscriminately

over all the earth. For every one perfectly knows that t
receive absolutely the same catalogue of the New Test
our Bible societies, without the difference of a single
single chapter, or a single verse.

Let us adore, then, that Divine Goodness which thus r
testimonies, that nothing may be wanting for the confir
our faith.

CHAPTER XIV.

FINAL INFERENCES.

678. WHAT striking facts, what powerful proofs have passed in review before us, all vying with each other in demonstrating that silent and sovereign use which God makes of the churches for the unchangeable preservation of His New Testament, a use perfectly similar to that which He has made of Israel during thirty-four centuries, for the preservation not less unchangeable of His ancient oracles!

In carrying on this review of the destinies of the New Testament, we could easily bring forward many other proofs of the same kind, but we are afraid of extending our work beyond all proper bounds; and, besides, our readers will be pleased to recollect that the doctrine of the canon is already established as to the oracles of Moses and the prophets. It is established by unparalleled facts—above all, by the testimony of the Son of God. It only remained for us to demonstrate it in regard to the oracles of the New Testament, and to the part assigned to all the churches of Christendom. It was our business to produce another quite different series of striking facts, extending through ages, and not less manifestly providential,—we have produced them. All of them, doubtless, have not equal value nor equal force; but the majority of them seem to us irresistible, and, taken in combination, they carry conviction.

679. And certainly it must be so, that the gates of hell might not prevail against the Church, since for this purpose God must prevent their prevailing against the Scriptures, on which the Church is founded. What should we be—in fact, what would the Church be—if God had not guaranteed His Sacred Volume from all alteration?

Moreover, all these new facts are in exact accordance with t
first ways of God respecting His written Word; they carry
harmoniously and uninterruptedly the miracle, thirty-three c
turies in duration, of the deposit committed to the Jewish peo
Never has there been in the ways of the Lord a gap, a disc
tinuity like that which must be acknowledged, if you admit th
while the ancient oracles have been committed to the miracul
guardianship of a whole people for a hundred generations,
guardianship of the new oracles, far more important, and given
all the nations of the earth, has not been committed to any
for these eighteen hundred years! But it is not so, and we
able to assert that the miracle of the churches, as guardians of
canon which has been perpetuated like that of the Jewish peo
as guardians of the Old Testament, presents an ascending p
gression of harmony and beauty. And seeing the Divine purp
accomplished in the one case by the constant fidelity of the Je
—a fidelity which began in the time of the Trojan war, and
never ceased—we must think it highly probable that, if it plea
God to give at a later period to the Gentiles another series
sacred oracles, He would also choose from among them other
positories commissioned to preserve this treasure till the great
of Jesus Christ. And how glorious must be the confirmation
our faith, when we have ascertained that this second miracle
been accomplished with even greater magnificence than the firs

680. Clasp, then, all your Scriptures to your hearts, ye Chr
tians of every rank and of every age! You have them from G

Clasp them all with the same tenderness and the same subm
sion, the twenty-seven given you by the churches, and the twen
two you receive from the Jews.[1] You hold them from
churches, you hold them from the Jews; but you have them fr
God—from God in their inspiration—from God in their preser
tion. You cannot read them with profit to your souls if they
not read with reverence; and they cannot be read with reverer
if not with a conviction of their authenticity and their inspirati
It is by this Word thus listened to, as descending from on hi
that you will receive from God repentance, peace, adoption, j
holiness, and life eternal!

[1] Divided, we repeat, into thirty-nine books by all Christian churches.

681. But for this purpose it is necessary, Christian brethren, that you should know your privilege; it is necessary that you avail yourselves of it with God, and before all men; it is necessary that, relying on the doctrine of the canon, you make use of your holy books with the same confidence with which, in their time, Jesus Christ and His apostles made use of the "oracles committed" to Israel; it is necessary that you should say, "It is written."

The same canon is clearly demonstrated to you; the seals of the living God are attached to it. Never forget it.

It is within the heart, no doubt, that God marks the Scriptures for His elect with the incomparable seals of His Spirit; but you have been able to see very clearly also, that, even externally, God has marked them with His own seal by means of the wonderful testimony of all the generations of the Jewish people, and of all the generations of the Christian churches throughout the world.

Bear in mind, then, Christian brethren, the miracle of the Scriptures, and their Divine preservation. Keep your eyes open to these signs of God, and ever guard against that lamentable inattention for which Jesus reproached His disciples when they forgot the miracle of the loaves.

"*Perceive ye not yet,*" He said to them, "*neither understand? have ye your heart yet hardened? having eyes, see ye not? do ye not remember?*" (Mark viii. 17.)

And why did they forget that miracle of the loaves? Alas! for the same reason that makes us too often forget the miracle of the Scriptures, and which ought, on the contrary, to render it more striking. For the reason that the sign, really so full of grandeur, was accomplished, as that of the Scriptures has been for so many centuries, without noise, without splendour, without parade, and with calmness. By natural means the people were seated on the grass, and the apostles carried the baskets from group to group. But, assuredly, it was not by accident that these five barley loaves and two fishes fed five thousand men. And assuredly, also, it is not an accident that the collection of the sacred books has been guarded for three thousand years, and that all the depositories render the same homage all over the earth to the written Word, that it may enlighten with the same light all God's elect. Cer-

tainly the same divine power is in operation to guide and c rule them.

Christians, forget not the miracle of the loaves! Forget that of the Scriptures!

682. And thou too, young man, who, touched by the l Word, hast had it in thy heart to preach it to the world, to cc crate to it thy life, and to prepare thyself at a distance from home by holy studies, go, leave thy country and thy father's h and, since it must be so, set out for the schools of science.

They are not always the schools of truth, nor of piety; bu dear youth, and set out with prayer, committing thyself to Saviour, and putting on for this enterprise "the whole armo God." On thy heart the shield of faith, on thy head the he of the hope of salvation, the girdle of truth on thy loins; above all, in thy hand, the sword of the Spirit, which is the V of God. In thy left hand Moses and the Prophets, such a Jewish people gave them to the world; in thy right hand twenty-seven scriptures of the New Testament, such as all Christian churches throughout the world have given them 1500 years.

Guard them, dear youth, and they will guard thee; g them with reverence, and thou wilt be in safety; thou wilt p thy studies under a divine unction; thou wilt be blessed. " tinue thou, Timothy, in the things thou hast learned, knowi whom thou hast learned them." "Avoid oppositions of sci falsely so called: which some professing have erred concer the faith," (2 Tim. iii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.)

Never allow thyself to take anything from this Holy Wo not the least book—the least epistle; it is of God thou h them; abandon nothing belonging to them, whoever may s thee, were he the most illustrious of the doctors of thy age, he in thy eyes an angel from heaven. Hast thou not seen aberrations? Surrender thyself to no man; God is above human name. Hold fast His Word—it is thy safe-guard; say with David, "Thou art my portion, O Lord; I have said I would keep thy words," (Ps. cxix. 57.)

If, then, they say to thee, What carriest thou in thy left h reply, The twenty scriptures of Moses and the Prophets.

who assures thee that they are from God? The Holy Spirit. I have felt His influence. Thou hast perhaps felt it in some passages; but who assures thee that all are equally from God? God Himself has declared that He intrusted them to the Jewish people, and the Jewish people have guarded them miraculously. But hast thou only this proof? If I had only this proof it would be sufficient. But I have many others. An astonishing and very numerous assemblage of marvellous facts, continued through centuries, and otherwise inexplicable, attest invincibly to me in this matter the intervention of the Lord and His fidelity. Moreover, I possess another most absolute and yet most simple proof, which alone renders all others superfluous: it is that same sword of the Spirit, the twenty-two Scriptures, which I carry in my hands; Jesus, my Saviour and my Master, carried them before me in His; through all His ministry He preached them; they were presented to Him in the synagogues; He read them there; He cited them to the devil and to men; He quoted all the books; He knew them without having studied them; He spoke of them constantly in His life, in His sufferings, even on the cross; and, after He had risen from the tomb, "He expounded" them from one end to the other to His disciples on the road to Emmaus, beginning at Moses, and going through all the prophets, (Luke xxiv. 27.) But our schools will teach thee not to receive them as of equal authority, and even to retrench superfluous books from this very Bible. They may do it; too often they have done it; but may God ever keep me from having another Bible than that which Jesus Christ had. To give up the Bible of Jesus Christ is to give HIM up, and *to give* HIM *up!*—rather than that, my God, I would suffer twenty deaths!

Such, dear youth, will be thy answer for the Old Testament; but it will not be less decided for the New. If, then, they ask thee again, What dost thou carry in thy right hand? thou wilt answer, I carry the sword of the Spirit—the inspired Word of the New Testament—the twenty-seven books given by Jesus Christ to found His Church and to extend it to the ends of the earth, looking forward to the time when "all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." But who assures thee, again, that these books are of God? I have felt it.

Yes; perhaps for some; but that they are all from God? D thou not know that there is not one which is not disputed in schools? I know it; but I know equally well that not one your schools can justify or sustain their objections by va reasons. I know, besides, as to the twenty-two *homologoume* forming thirty-five thirty-sixths of the whole New Testam that, by science itself, it may be established that there has ne been a book in the whole field of literature, ancient or mod sacred or profane, of an authenticity so powerfully guaranteed; that already, on grounds of reason, all the attacks of your sch ought to confine their efforts to that thirty-sixth remaining of the Sacred Volume. And yet, even for that thirty-sixth p I have very simple and powerful reasons of assurance, within reach of the humblest Christians, and of the least cultiva classes; for these classes have every day before their eyes a pr for the New Testament quite similar to that which the anci people had for the Old Testament; for God has chosen a pe entirely new to whom His new oracles have been intrusted, order to be on their part the witness and guarantee.

"Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the wo began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting G made known to all nations for the obedience of faith; to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever. Amen," (R xvi. 25–27.)

APPENDIX ON THE APOCRYPHA.

(CHAPTER V.)

THIRTY-SIX PROPOSITIONS TRANSFERRED HERE, AND RESERVED FOR THE END OF THE VOLUME.

SECTION FIRST.

HISTORY OF THE APOCRYPHA TO THE TIME OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

484. THE universal Church of the second, third, and fourth centuries, as we shall soon shew, had never ceased to receive the Old Testament, such as the Jews gave them to us, and carefully distinguished the apocryphal from the canonical books, when God raised up among the Latins a great light in the person of Jerome. This illustrious doctor, born in 331, was to be, during eleven centuries—to the time of the Council of Trent—their counsellor and guide in the study of the Scriptures. He had, in fact, recalled them, more than any other person, to the pure sources of the biblical Word, and had translated for them, for the first time, the Old Testament according to the original Hebrew,[1] thus giving them that famous version which they named the *Vulgate*, and which at a later period they declared to be *canonical* in all its parts. Jerome indeed has enjoyed such credit in the Church of Rome, that, in her *Breviary*, she thanks God "for having raised up in His Church this blessed and illustrious doctor for the exposition of the Holy Scriptures," so that, in our day, every year, on the 30th of September, all the priests of the Papacy, from one end of the world to the other, are bound to repeat this prayer in

[1] All prior versions had been made according to the Greek of the Septuagint.

Latin—"*Deus, qui Ecclesiae tuae in exponendis Sacris Scr turis* beatum *Hieronymum* doctorem maximum *providere digna es. . . .*"[1]

And it was in the same spirit that, to the time of the Cou of Trent, the Church of Rome, even in the sixteenth century, l never ceased to place the *Prefaces of Jerome* at the head of her editions of the Bible, and even a very short time before Council, all these prefaces declared that Christians ought ca fully to distinguish the canonical books from the apocryp See, for example, that of Birckman, at Antwerp, (1526,) the lit version of the Bible, published at Lyons by the Dominican San Pagnini, (1528,) and that which Robert Stephens gave in edition of Vatablus, (1545.)

485. But what do we see from the time of the Council Trent? Everything has so changed in relation to Jerome in Church of Rome that, though this father could declare in the fou century that he rejected the history of Susanna and the Song the Three Hebrew Children, and that he regarded the History Bel and the Dragon as a fable; and though, nevertheless, he been for eleven centuries in the Church of Rome not only, as *Breviary* says, one of the greatest doctors, (*doctor maximus,*) one of the saints in Paradise who are to be invoked, yet anathema was pronounced there, April 15, 1546, against whoe should speak of the eleven apocryphal scriptures as he has spo of them.

And yet the testimony of this father on those eleven apocryp books is so abundant, and, at the same time, so very explicit, t to escape from it, the defenders of the council have felt th selves obliged to have recourse to the most pitiful evasions.

"This father," says the famous bishop Catherin, "did mean to give us his own opinion so much as that of the Jev Whoever has read Jerome will appreciate this paltry subterfug

"He varies," says the Jesuit Gretser, "as to the number of books, and is not logical." He is very logical.

[1] Brev. Rom., Sep. xxx., p. 882; ed. Paris, 1840.

[2] Dr Herbst the Catholic (Einleit. ins A. T.) refuses to refer the assertion Jerome to the Roman unity, and confines himself to look at them as the opin of an individual.

"When he was induced to put this stumbling-block in the way by his intercourse with the Jews of Palestine," says the Cardinal du Perron, "he was not in the maturity of his studies." He was fifty-seven when he went to settle in Palestine; he was seventy-eight when he wrote his decision against the books of Susanna, the Three Hebrew Children and Bel; he was eighty-seven when he wrote his decision against Baruch.[1]

"He was mistaken," says the same Du Perron, "regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews." He made no mistake whatever. On the contrary, we are indebted to him for bringing the Roman Church back from its error. "*Nos et Apocalypsin et Epistolam Pauli ad Hebraeos recipimus*," he says in his Epistle to Dardanus.

"Better instructed afterwards in the judgment of the Church, Jerome retracted his own," says Du Perron again. This is equally false.

"It is manifest that the authority of Jerome is not of great weight in this controversy," M. Malon, the present Bishop of Bruges, has lately said. "He at first expressed," the same writer adds,[2] "*an opinion contrary to the belief of the Church;* and when he was accused of abandoning the tradition of the apostles, he disavowed the doctrine charged upon him—he repudiated the canon of the Jews." On this Dr Wordsworth properly remarks, "M. Malon refers to the *second apology* of Jerome against Rufinus to sustain this unwarrantable assertion; but after most carefully reading this writing of Jerome, I confidently reply, that he retracts nothing!"[3]

Lastly, other modern doctors, such as the celebrated M. Perrone, now head of the College of the Jesuits at Rome, and others besides, after having sought for different evasions, have seen no other refuge but the unfortunate theory of "development," employed by Dr Manning.

"The canon of the Old Testament," says M. Perrone, not having

[1] Comment on Jeremiah. See Cave, Scriptur. Eccl. Hist. Lit., fol., tom i., p. 280. Basil, 1741.

[2] Lecture de la Sainte Bible, Louvaine, 1846. Vol. ii., p. 57.

[3] On the Canon of the Scriptures, and on the Apocrypha, by C. Wordsworth, D.D., London, 1848. Append., p. 24.

been completed by the Church in the fourth century, the apocryp books were not canonised, (*canonici nequaquam erant.*)" [1]

According to this system, a book is from God in the sixtee century which had never been so to Israel to the time of Jesus Chr and which had not been so to the Christian Church for fourt centuries after Him. This would be a new transubstantiat under always the same species of a book in which nothing vis was changed!

486. Of sixteen writings which Jerome rejects as apocryp and we reject with him, Rome admits ELEVEN as Divine, (c *unus Deus sit auctor.*)

They are, first of all, the seven following books:—Tobit, Jud First and Second of Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baru then three separate Greek fragments, added to the Hebrew can cal text of Daniel, (The Song of the Hebrew Children, the Hist of Susanna, The History of Bel;) then, seven chapters in Gr added to the Hebrew text of Esther.

After the catalogue of the sacred books was enlarged by th eleven apocryphal writings, the council added this anathema: "A if any one do not receive as sacred and canonical these books en with all their parts, according as it has been customary to r them in the universal Church, and as they are found in the anci edition of the Latin Vulgate; and if he despise, knowingly and tentionally, the above-named tradition—LET HIM BE ANATHEMA.

487. When the fifty[3] ecclesiastics assembled at Trent, Apri 1546, dared to issue such a decree, which for the first time pla the apocryphal books on a level with the Scriptures of God, they only belied the only true depositories of His Divine Oracles, "t fabricated at their pleasure," says Bishop Cosin, (in his excell work on the canon,)[4] "a new article of faith, of which neither

[1] The Church of Rome rejects only the five following—The Prayer of Manas the Third of Esdras, the Third and Fourth of Maccabees.

[2] "Si quis autem libros ipsos integros, cum omnibus suis partibus, prou Ecclesiâ catholicâ legi consueverunt, et in veteri Vulgatâ Latinâ editione haber pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit; et traditiones praedictas sciens et pru contempserit—ANATHEMA SIT!"

[3] Forty-five bishops and five cardinals, all, or almost all Italians, and pensio of the Pope. See the following Proposition.

[4] Scholastical History of the Canon; London, 1672 and 1683; in 4to. See articles 165 to 175, 177 to 179. We take from this work the greater numb

other churches of Christendom nor their own church had ever heard spoken of before; and they created in the universal Church a deeper schism than the wickedness of men had ever produced."

They proceeded even to the length of excluding all those, who like Jesus Christ and His apostles, like the ancient fathers, like the author of their Vulgate, like the whole existing Church of the East, more ancient than their own, refused to attribute to the apocryphal books the same authority as to the writings of Moses and the Prophets. So that their canon is no longer that of the Hebrew nation, nor of Jesus Christ, nor of the universal primitive Church, nor even that of the ancient Latin Church for 1500 years. It is the canon of the Jesuits, or the new canon of the Council of Trent.

And it is thus, then, by leaving to the wandering of their own thoughts, men whose pretensions rose to the height of proclaiming themselves the sole interpreters of His Sacred Word, God, by a most righteous judgment, has permitted that they, alone of all the sects of Christendom, have by a solemn decree foisted eleven human uninspired books into His Sacred Oracles! And this nineteen hundred years after the era when every prophet, waiting for the Messiah, had disappeared from the midst of Israel!

488. But more than this. This act will appear more astonishing, if possible, when the profane levity with which it was consummated is taken into account. It was a surprisal, a *coup d'état* of the Church of Rome, resembling that which has taken place in our own days, when the new dogma respecting the Virgin Mary was fabricated. Perhaps it would be right to say that the dogma of 1546 was framed in the Council of Trent with a greater contempt of the Church and its rights, than that with which Pius IX. is reproached for throwing from the Vatican, on what he calls "the universal Church," his doctrine of an Immaculate Conception by the Saviour's grandmother. We shall not here speak of the intrigues which for a long time eluded, and at last prepared and governed the council. History sufficiently asserts them. We wish only to call to mind the nature of the sittings from which this decree issued.

the testimonies which follow. See also the History of the Council of Trent, by Paul Sarpi. Book ii., arts. 37, 46, 48, 54. Edit., London, 1736; pp. 220, 241.

When the Pope, in 1545, had sent his three legates to Trent, they found on their arrival no one there, excepting the bishop of the place, and, a few days after, three Italian bishops. Two months passed away before they were recruited by twenty other prelates the greater part also Italians; so that, ashamed to open with so small a company a universal council which Europe believed to be destined to reform the Church "in its chief and in its members," they persuaded the Pope to adjourn it for eight months. A pension of twenty ducats was allowed to each of those bishops who were poor, to keep them from growing impatient. But in December, they found their number increased to forty-three, and opened this council, called oecumenical, which was about to add so many new doctrines to the dogmas already professed, to change the canon, to set unwritten traditions on a level with the oracles of the living God, and probably close for ever the era of councils.

The Council of Chalcedon, when, in 451, it sanctioned the decrees of Laodicea, and in so doing refuted the Apocrypha, was composed of six hundred and thirty bishops;[1] but at Trent, when the last of the councils was opened, there were only, besides the Pope's three legates and the bishop of the place, four archbishops, twenty-eight bishops, three abbots, and four generals of orders. And further, two of these archbishops, Olaüs the Goth, and Robert of Scotland, were mere nominal bishops, pensioners of the Pope, and sent to make up the number.

The first and the second session (December 12 and January 7) were devoted only to preliminaries; on the third (February 4) the Nicene Creed was recited; but on the fourth (April 8) the anathemas began, and it closed, after four different opinions had been proposed, by cursing the Christians who would not receive their new canon of the Scriptures, and who would not set on the same level (*pari pietatis affectu et reverentia*) the indefinite body of unwritten traditions, (*tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel Spiritu Sancti dictatas.*)

Such, then, was the decision adopted in the name of the Universal Church by the majority of these forty-five ecclesiastics, and a very small number of persons who arrived after the opening of the council. "And so," says Bishop Cosin, "while they could

[1] Jean le Sueur. 4e partie; p. 374.

not find either father or council, scholar or writer who in former ages had ever spoken like themselves, they decided to pass a decree so vainly called oecumenical. In fact, of the Greek Church there was not a single member; from England no one, (Richard Pates had not arrived;) from the Helvetic or German Churches, no one; from France itself at most only two prelates; from Spain, five; from Illyria, one. All the rest were Italians;[1] and even many among them pensioners of the Pope, bishops of small places sent to vote with the legates, and very ignorant.[2] . . . So that, supposing each of them a representative of the people and of the clergy, by whom he might pretend to be sent, we may say with truth, that this convention did not represent the thousandeth part of Christendom."

SECTION SECOND

UNANIMITY OF THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHURCH AGAINST THE DECREE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

489. We are going to shew with what unanimity the testimony of the whole Church was raised against the admission of the Apocrypha; but many other reasons relating to these books ought to have deterred the council from placing them on a level with the oracles of God. We do not wish to explain them at large, and shall content ourselves with indicating them here very rapidly:—

(1.) While all the books of the Old Testament are written in Hebrew,[3] the apocryphal books are only in Greek.

(2.) In the drama of Susanna we meet with instances of playing upon words which have no value or meaning, excepting in Greek, and which absolutely could not be imagined or employed

[1] Sleidan, Comment., lib. xvii.—"In his duo Galli; quinque Hispani; Illyricus unus; reliqui omnes Itali."

[2] Some did not even know Latin. "Eorum aliqui nec benè Latine legere noverunt."—*Alph. de Castro, De Haer. Punit.*, lib. iii.

[3] Or at least in Aramean. Jerome is said to have translated Tobit and Judith from the Chaldee, and to have seen the first book of Maccabees in Hebrew. The Preface of Ecclesiasticus represents that book as translated from the Hebrew. (See the Einleitung of the Catholic professor, Welte; Freid., 1844.) Yet Hengstenberg (Beiträge, i., 292) believes that the Greek text is the original of the first Maccabees. Jahn (Introd., ii., 902, 922) expresses the same opinion about Tobit and Judith.

but in a country where the Greek was the vernacular language. (Vers. 55 and 58.)

(3.) All these books were composed after the spirit of prophecy had entirely ceased in Israel.

(4.) Many learned men (as Moldenhauer) have given very strong reasons for believing that some of the apocryphal books, such as Tobit, the Fourth book of Esdras, and, perhaps, Wisdom, are posterior even to the birth of Jesus Christ.[1]

(5.) None of their authors directly pretend to inspiration, excepting that of the book of Wisdom, who, while calling himself Solomon, discloses his imposture by citing many passages in Isaiah and Jeremiah, and representing his contemporaries as already subject to their enemies, (ix. 7, 8; xv. 14; compare 1 Kings iv. 20–25.)

(6.) Very far from pretending to be inspired, many profess not to be so. (See the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus; 1 Macc. iv. 46, and xi. 27; 2 Macc. ii. 23, and xv. 38.)

(7.) No part of the Apocrypha is found quoted by Jesus Christ, or by any apostle.[2]

(8.) Neither Philo nor Josephus cites them; while, on the contrary, the testimony of Josephus, alleged by Eusebius,[3] and cited by us,[4] is most decisive on the fixation of the inspired books, and on the totally uninspired character of other Jewish writings.

(9.) The apocryphal books contain many fables, opposed both to historic truth and to the Holy Scriptures. See Bel and the Dragon, the History of Tobit, &c. (Compare 2 Macc. i. 18 with Ezra iii. 2, 3; and 2 Macc. iii. 5–8 with Jer. iii. 16.)

(10.) The first and second books of Maccabees contradict one another. In the one, Antiochus Epiphanes died at Babylon, (1 Macc. vi. 16;) in the other, he is killed and beheaded by the Persian priests in the temple of Nanea, (2 Macc. i. 14–16, &c.;) then, afterwards, (ix. 28,) he is said to have died "in a strange land, in the mountains." The second book is evidently very inferior to the first.

[1] Horne's Introduction. Vol. ii., pp. 326–329. 1818.
[2] See Propp. 465, 466. See also Keerl., Die Apocryphenfrage; Leipz., 1855.
[3] Hist. Eccl., iii., 9, 10.
[4] Contra Apion., i., 8. See Propp. 435, 457.

(11.) These same books commend in many passages immoral acts. We may see examples more than sufficient in the preface placed at the head of the Apocrypha, in the excellent French Bible of Des Marets.

490. "After having made an exact and complete review of all the Church has professed in all ages and in all countries relating to the canon of the Old Testament," says Bishop Cosin, "I conclude that the voice of all ages and of all portions of the people of God bear testimony against the decree of the Council of Trent." [1]

Fully to appreciate the force of this historical testimony, we must follow the author from age to age, and from country to country. He passes under review—In *Palestine* and *Syria*, Justin Martyr,[2] Eusebius,[3] Jerome,[4] and John of Damascus.[5] In the apostolic churches of *Asia Minor*, Melito,[6] Polycrates,[7] and Onesimus. In *Phrygia, Cappadocia, Lycaonia*, and *Cyprus*, the Council of Laodicea,[8] St Basil the Great,[9] Amphilochius,[10]

[1] Cosin, Hist. Schol. of the Canon. See also Gerhard, De Scriptura Sacra, §§ 75-98; and Keerl, Die Apocryphen des A. T., § 18; Leipz., 1852.

[2] Who neither approves nor cites any of the apocryphal books.

[3] Hist. Eccl., iv., 25; vi., 12.

[4] In 392. Cosin cites thirteen striking testimonies of this father against the Apocrypha. See his Prologues, which have served so long as a rule to the Latin Church:—"Sicut Judith et Tobiae et Maccabaeorum libros *legit* quidem *Ecclesia*, sed *eas inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit;* sic et haec duo volumina (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus) *legat* ad aedificationem plebis, *non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.*"—*In Proverbia*, tom. iii., p. 39; Paris, 1602.

[5] He reckons only twenty-two books in the Old Testament, like all the Jews.—*De Fide Orthod.*, lib. iv., cap. 18.

[6] Bishop of Sardis in the middle of the second century. In 160, he made exact researches respecting the canonical books of the Old Testament; and travelled for this purpose, Eusebius tells us, (H. E., iv., 26.) He enumerates twenty-two books, and excludes the Apocrypha.

[7] Bishop of Ephesus in 160. His testimony to Melito, (Eusebius, H. E., v., 24.)

[8] Held in 364 for many provinces of Asia; highly esteemed by all the churches in those remote ages, having had its canons received into the "*Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Univ.*," where the year of its being held is fixed to be 364. It entirely rejects the Apocrypha.

[9] In 375. He reckons only twenty-two books in the Old Testament.—*Philocal.*, cap. iii.

[10] Bishop of Iconium in 378. He gives his catalogue, and excludes the Apocrypha from it, (Ep. ad Seleucum.) Among the canonical epistles collected by Balsamon.

and Epiphanius.[1] In *Egypt*, Clement of Alexandria,[2] Origen and the great Athanasius.[4] In the churches of *Africa*, Julius Africanus,[5] Tertullian,[6] the great Augustin,[7] the Council Carthage,[8] Junelius,[9] and Primasius.[10] In each of the five *Patriarchates*, Cyril of Jerusalem,[11] Gregory of Nazianzus,[12] Chrysostom of Constantinople,[13] Anastasius of Antioch,[14] Pope Gregory, called the Great,[15] Nicephorus of Constantinople,[16] and the celebrated Balsamon, named Patriarch of Antioch.[17] In *Greece*, Dionysius Antiochus, Adrian, Leontius, Zonaras, Philip, and Callistus. In *Italy*, Philastrius,[18] Ruffinus,[19] Cassiodorus,[20] Antoninus,[21] Jol

[1] Bishop of Salamis in 374. Reckons the books of the Old Testament as we d —*De Mens. et Ponder.; Haer.*, viii.

[2] Origen's teacher speaks as he does.

[3] In 220. Declares distinctly that the books not included in the twenty-t do not belong to the canon.—*Apud Euseb.; Ruffin.*, vi., 25.

[4] He has given us, in 340, a catalogue of *canonical* books, which he distinguish from *ecclesiastical* books. He reckons only twenty-two in the Old Testament. *Epist. Festalis.*, opp., tom. i., p. 94, ed. Bened. *Opera, apud Balsam.*, p. 920.

[5] In 222, writing to Origen, he rejects the History of Susanna.—*Op Origenis*, tom. ii.

[6] In 204. He excludes the Apocrypha from the canon.—*Contra Marcion*, ca iv., 7.

[7] See Prop. 499, and the following. [8] Ibid.

[9] In 543. He recognises a great difference between the *canonical* books and t ecclesiastical.—*De Partibus Divinae Legis*, lib. i., cap. 7.

[10] In 553. So long after the Council of Carthage held the same views of t canon as Jerome and the Jews.—*In Apocalyps.*, cap. iv., v.

[11] In 360. He gave his auditors a catalogue of the Scriptures. It is very explic —*Catech.*, iv., vi., and ix.

[12] In 376. Is very explicit and decisive.—*In Libro.*, carm. xxxiii., tom. ii., p. 3 See our Prop.

[13] In 390. Declares there are no canonical books besides those written in Hebr —*Hom.* iv. *in Genes.*

[14] Patriarch of Antioch in 560, expressly affirms that God gave twenty-t books for His Old Testament.—*Hexameron*, lib. vii.

[15] Pope in 590. Professes to follow the canon of the ancient Church, as Jero represented it.—*Moral. Expos. in Job*, lib. xix., cap. xvii., [or xiii.]

[16] Patriarch of Constantinople in 820. Distinguishes the *canonical* books fr the *controverted* and the *apocryphal*.—*Canon Script. ex veteri Codice.*

[17] In 1192, died in 1203. In his commentaries on the Council of Carthage. appeals to the Council of Laodicea, and to the epistles of Athanasius, and Gregory of Nazianzus.

[18] In 380, (*De Haeres.*, cap. de Apocryph.) He rejects Ecclesiasticus.

[19] In 398. Speaks like Jerome.—*In Symb. Apost.*, sect. xxxv., xxxvi.

[20] Consul of Rome, in 550, (*De Divinis Lectionibus*, cap. xii.). Begins w Jerome's catalogue, and then joins to it the books of Augustin's enumeration.

[21] See Prop. 515.

Picus de Mirandola,[1] and Cardinal Cajetan.[2] In *Spain*, Isidore of Seville,[3] Cardinal Hugo,[4] Paul de Burgos,[5] at first Bishop of Carthagena; Alphonsus Tostatus,[6] and the celebrated Cardinal Ximenes,[7] so renowned for his Polyglott Bible and his biblical researches. In *France*, Hilary of Poictiers,[8] the theologians of Marseilles,[9] Victorinus of Poictiers, the bishops of Charlemagne, Agobard of Lyons,[10] Radulph of Flavigny, Honorius of Autun, Peter of Cluny, Hugo and Richard of St Victor at Paris, John Beleth, Peter de Cell, Hervaeus Natalis of Brittany, James Le Fevre d'Etaples, and Jodochus Clichtoveus.[11] In *Germany* and in *the Low Countries*, the Archbishop of Mentz, Raban Maurus, Walafrid Strabo the Benedictine, the monk Herman Contractus, Ado Archbishop of Vienne; Rupert de Tuits, the famous ordinary and interlineary gloss on the Bible, (*Praef. de Libr. Canon;*) the gloss on the Canon Law by John Semeca, (*Dist.* 16;) Nicolas de Lyra,[12] Dionysius à Ryckel, the Carthusian; the celebrated Erasmus,[13] John Driedo of Louvaine,[14] and John Ferus,[15] died at Mentz in 1554, nine years after the opening of the Council of Trent. Lastly, in *England*, the venerable Bede,[16] Alcuin, the companion of Charlemagne;[17] Giselbert, John of Salisbury, Brito, (the commentator on

[1] See Prop. 491, (*a, b, c, d, e, i.*) [2] Ibid.

[3] In 636. He distinguishes, after the Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, a fourth class of books, which do not belong to the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament. —Lib. vi., *Originum*, cap. i.

[4] In 1244. Maintains the distinction of *canonical* and *ecclesiastical* books.—*Prol. in Jos.*

[5] In 1430.—*Addit.* i., ad cap. i.; *Ester.*, cap. xiii.

[6] See Prop. 491, (*a, b, c, d, e, i.*) [7] Ibid.

[8] In 350. Agreed with Athanasius on the Apocrypha as well as on Arianism.—*Prol. Explanat. in Psalmor.*

[9] In 426. They rejected the book of Wisdom.—*Hilary of Arles in his Epistle to Augustin.*

[10] In 855. Asserts that the Old Testament has only twenty-two books of divine authority.—*De Privil. et Jure Sacerdot.*

[11] See Prop. 491, (*a, b, c, d, e, i.*)

[12] In 1320. Is very explicit (Praefat. in Tobiam) in excluding the Apocrypha from the canon.

[13] See Prop. 491, (*h, k, l.*) [14] Ibid. [15] Ibid.

[16] In 730. He agrees with Jerome and Tertullian.—*In Apocal.* iv., lib. iv.; *Comment. in Lib. Reg.*

[17] In 800. Rejected as *apocryphal* and *doubtful* the book of Ecclesiasticus.—*Adv. Elipantum*, lib. i., col. 941.

Jerome's *Prologue;*) William Occam,[1] Thomas Anglicus, o
Walden,[2] sent to the Council of Constance.

All these witnesses, of whom a great number are saint
ised by the Church of Rome, however carried away they
been on other points by the errors of their age, are unani
this—that is to say, in distinguishing the apocryphal bo
the oracles of God, or rejecting them entirely.

491. But in order that some voices from this cloud of
may be more distinctly heard, and to shew more clearly
new and sudden lapse the Church of Rome, aggrava
schism, has continued to depart from the truth, we will
unanimity of the authors who spoke within her pale eve
beginning of the sixteenth century, and at the near app
the Council of Trent.

(*a.*) From 1502 to 1517, Francis Ximenes, cardinal, ar
of Toledo, grand inquisitor, founder of the university o
confessor to the queen, and governor of Castile, edited
brated Polyglott Bible which bears his name. Now the
face of this great work warns the readers, "that the
Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees
as the additions to Esther and Daniel, are not canonical scr
All those persons who agreed with the great Cardinal
were thought fit to be anathematised thirty years after
council.

(*b.*) In 1506, about the same time, the Vulgate was p
with the commentary of Lyra, and the ordinary gloss,
Now, the preface of this Bible takes care to establish a d
between the twenty-two books of our ancient canon an
which are added in the new, as a difference between what
tain and what is *doubtful.* It goes even so far as to
only with carelessness and ignorance, but with *folly*, th
believe that all these books are worthy of equal venerat
cause they see them printed in the same volume as the Bi

(*c.*) In 1510, the famous John Picus, Count of Mirand

[1] In 1330. Positively rejects the Apocrypha from the number of the books.—*Dialog.*, part iii., tract. i., lib. iii., cap. 16.

[2] In 1420. Acknowledges only the twenty-two canonical books.—*Fid.*, tom. i., lib. ii., art. 2, cap. 22.

living, "that man so distinguished," said Bellarmin, "for his genius and learning."[1] He says, in speaking of the Apocrypha, "Yet I believe that we must firmly adhere to St Jerome's opinion, by whose authority I have been guided." "His testimony," he adds, "is esteemed most sacred by the Church."[2]

(*d.*) In 1514, James Le Fevre d'Etaples, doctor of the university of Paris, a man in great repute at that time, says of the apocryphal books, while holding them in respect, "They are no part of the canon, nor of the first and supreme authority in the Church. (*De canone non sunt, et in primâ supremâque Ecclesiae auctoritate.*)"

(*e.*) In 1520, *Jodochus Clichtoveus*, (Josse Clichtove,) a Sorbonist, and canon of Chartres, in his Commentary on John of Damascus, (lib. iv., cap. 14,) excludes all the apocryphal books from the canon of the Holy Scriptures. "*Et non modo hi duo libri*," he says, in speaking of the books of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, "*non numerati sunt in canone sacrorum librorum, sed etiam Tobias, Judith, et libri Maccabaeorum à numero canonicorum voluminum V. T. sunt exclusi; quaemadmodum testatur Hieronymus.*"

(*f.*) In 1525, *Louis Vives*, one of the most learned men of his time, in his commentaries on Augustin's *City of God*, rejects, besides the third and fourth books of Esdras, the histories of Bel and of Susanna. Moreover, he also rejects the books of *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and the *Maccabees*, attributing the first to Philo the Jew;[3] the second to the Son of Sirach, (who lived a hundred years after the last of the prophets;) and, as to the third, "not knowing," he says,[4] "whether Jerome has not attributed it to the historian Josephus."

(*g.*) In 1526, George of Venice, a friar minor, (*cordelier*,) in his *Harmony of the World*, excludes all these books from the canon. (Cant. iii., tom. viii., mod. 12.)

(*h.*) In 1530, the illustrious Erasmus, at that time of such high repute in the Catholic world, though hated by the monks, in his *Exposition of the Apostles' Creed and the Decalogue*, (Catech. iv.,

[1] De Script.—"Vir ingenio et doctrinâ maximus."

[2] "Firmiter tamen haerendum credo sententiae Hieronymi cujus auctoritas me movit." "Et demum ejus testimonium ab Ecclesiâ pro sanctissimo habetur." —*De Ordine Credenti*, i., v.

[3] Lib. xvii., cap. 20.

[4] Lib. xviii., cap. 36.

sub fin.) he speaks of all the apocryphal books as received much later, solely for ecclesiastical use, (*in usum ecclesiasticum.*[1]) He adds, that many attributed the book of Wisdom to Philo. And in his preface to Daniel he is astonished that any one could read in the churches such histories as those of Bel and the Dragon.[2] "It is certainly of importance," he says elsewhere, "to know what the Church approves, and in what sense it does so, (*quid quo animo comprobet Ecclesia.*)" "For while she attributes an equal authority (*parem auctoritatem*) to the writings of the Jews, and to the four Gospels, she certainly would not attach the same weight to the books of Judith, Tobit, and Wisdom, as to the Pentateuch of Moses."[3]

(*i.*) In 1534, the celebrated Cardinal Cajetan (Thomas de Vio, Bishop of Gaëta) sent as a legate into Germany by Pope Leo X. to bring back Luther to the Church, was then regarded as a "general oracle," says his contemporary Strozzi;[4] "almost all the theologians of the Church of Rome had recourse to him; (*ad quem velut commune oraculum seu pro Sacrarum Litterarum involucris . . . . seu pro altioribus theologicæ mysteriis . . . . confugere solebamus.*)"

But Cajetan, on the question of the apocryphal books often expresses the same opinion as ourselves, either in his Commentaries on Thomas Aquinas, or in those he wrote at Rome itself, or very near the Council of Trent, on the Holy Scriptures.[5]

He says, on the first chapter of the Hebrews, "The books that Jerome has handed down to us as canonical, (*canonicas tradidit,*) we hold to be canonical, and those which he has separated from the canon, (*à canone discrevit,*) we hold to be out of the canon, (*extra canonem habemus.*)" But we have already said with what decision Jerome has expressed himself against the Apocrypha.

[1] Opp., v., 977, (ed. Troben., 1540.)

[2] Epist. ad Divinar. Litterar. Studiosos, Praefexa, tom. iv., oper. Hieron.

[3] "Certè non vult idem esse pondus Judith, Tobiæ, et Sapientiæ libris quod Mosis Pentateucho."

[4] In the dedicatory espistle at the head of his works.

[5] The public library at Geneva possesses the Commentaries of Cajetan, *In Omnes Authenticos Veteris Testam. Historiales Libros*, printed at Rome in 1533. The Pope's Penitentiary superintended the edition. Cajetan enumerates the books on which he has commented,—"*Omissis reliquis ab Hieronymo inter apocrypha supputatis.*"

"After Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi," he says on Isaiah xlix. 21, "I have seen no other prophet till John the Baptist!"

Cajetan also says, in his dedicatory epistle to Pope Clement VII. (at the head of his commentary on the historical books of the Old Testament)—an epistle approved by the Pope—"Most holy father, the whole Latin Church is under the greatest obligations to St Jerome on account of the distinction he has made between the canonical books and the uncanonical. He has delivered us from the OPPROBRIUM which would have rested upon us in the eyes of the Hebrews, (*ab Hebræorum opprobio,*) of appearing to regard as part of the canon, books and portions of books which the Hebrews enterely want, (*quod fingamus nobis antique canonis libros aut librorum partes quibus ipsi penitus carent.*)"

He says again, on the last chapter of Esther, "These books are not canonical (*non sunt regulares*) to confirm the matters of faith, (*ad firmandum ea quae sunt fidei.*") "But yet," he adds, in the sense in which Augustin sometimes spoke, "they might be called *canonical*—that is to say, *books serving as a rule* (regulares) *to be employed for the edification of the faithful.*"

It is thus that Jerome had said, (on the books of Solomon, to Chromatius and Heliodorus,) "In the same way as the Church reads the books of the Maccabees, Tobit, and Judith, without receiving them into the number of the canonical writings, so we may treat *Ecclesiasticus* and the book of *Wisdom*, reading them for edification, and not to authorise dogmas. (*Sic et haec duo volumina legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandum.*)"

Thus, then, it is very evident that, even to the days of Luther and Cajetan, (his opponent on behalf of the Pope,) in 1533—that is to say, eleven or twelve years before the Council of Trent began, our entire doctrine on the Apocrypha, which is that of the so-called orthodox Catholic Church of the East, was held at Rome as good and orthodox.

Cajetan, "the oracle of the Roman Church," says Strozzi; Cajetan, "*vir summi ingenii nec minoris pietatis*," says Bellarmin; Cajetan, "*excellentissimè Catholicus*," says Soto; Cajetan, "*incomparabilis theologus*," says Sextus of Sienna,—this Cajetan, when he died in 1535, would in all probability, say the historians of the

time, have been chosen Pope to succeed Clement VII. But eleven years after Cajetan's death, the fifty-three ecclesiastics assembled at Trent, issued this decree, "If any one do not receive as holy and canonical these books, with all their parts, such as they are in the Vulgate version—*let him be anathema!*" Yet we must suppose that these declarations so recent and so explicit of the illustrious cardinal would occasion them some embarrassment. "Therefore," says Cosin, "Catharin and Canus barked at the dead lion; but neither these two men nor any other person dared write against him on this subject during his life-time, when he was on the spot to answer them. Catharin could bring against him after his death nothing but the uncertain authorities of three popes," of whom a satisfactory account is given in Proposition 493. But this is not all.

(*k.*) In 1555, Driedo, a doctor of Louvaine, while Cajetan was dying, was employed to write against Luther, and yet he did not the less acknowledge in his "Four books of Holy Scripture and of Ecclesiastical Dogmas," dedicated to the King of Portugal, "That the Christian Church, although she reads the apocryphal books with pious regard, because of some holy authors of antiquity who made use of them; though she does not reject them entirely, nor despise them, nevertheless she has not received them as having equal authority with the canonical books. (*Ecclesia tamen Christiana propter auctoritatem veterum quorumdam sanctorum qui leguntur usi fuisse testimoniis ex hujusmodi historiis, eadem qua ii fide legit et non prorsus rejicit nec contemnit, tametsi non pari auctoritate recipiat illos libros cum scripturis canonicis.*)"[1]

Let this striking testimony against the council, which followed it so closely, be carefully noted.

(*l.*) In 1540, 1546, John Ferus, of the order of the minor friars, who died in 1554, a learned man and an able preacher, published, a little time after the council was assembled, his work, entitled, "*Examination of those who are to be ordained,*" and this book, though *afterwards inserted in the Index*, met with general approbation during the author's life-time. He never heard of any attack upon it. Now, he had said to his disciples, "These are the apocryphal books—third and fourth of Esdras, Judith, Ecclesiasticus,

[1] Lib. i., d. 4, ad diffic. 3.

Baruch, and the two books of the Maccabees. All the others are called canonical. (*Sunt autem hi libri apocryphi: tertius et quartus Esdrae, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch et Maccabaeorum libri duo. Omnes alii dicuntur canonici.*)" He adds, that "formerly the apocryphal books were not read publicly in the churches, but only at home. (*Olim vero in ecclesia, apocryphi publicè non recitabantur; nec quisquam auctoritate eorum premebatur; sed domi quidem et privatim pro suo cujusque animo fas erat illos legere.*)"

492. Thus, then, from this vast "cloud of witnesses" we can draw the following conclusions:—

(1.) That the reformed religion, as well as the Greek Church, in the rejection of the Apocrypha, has the continued assent through all ages of the universal Church, including even the Latin Church till the time of the Council of Trent.

(2.) That, since the days of the apostles, this unanimity is founded on the same recognition of the apostolic dogma relating to the canon of the Old Testament. "*Proferantur codices Judaeorum,*" said all the fathers, with Augustin as well as with Jerome. "*Judaei, tanquam capsarii nostri sunt. Studentibus nobis codices portant.*" They incessantly repeat, "THE TWENTY-TWO CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE JEWS."

(3.) If former ages—which never assimilated the apocryphal books entirely to the twenty-two inspired books of the Old Testament—sometimes, influenced by the Septuagint, granted them a place in the public or private readings of the church, as was also permitted to the Acts of the Martyrs, and as even the Anglican Church still does on certain days, according to her liturgy,—if even it had been customary to bind up these uninspired books with the Sacred Volume, at the same time constantly giving notice that they were not held to be divine, it must be acknowledged that this practice brought forth evil fruits by giving them an ill-defined importance to which they had no title, and by lowering in popular estimation the idea of Divine inspiration.

(4.) That the Bible societies have deserved well of all the churches in making these uninspired books return to their proper position—for by their energetic resolutions, and by their absolute refusal to lend any aid to ecclesiastical associations,

which, by mixing the pure and impure together, persisted in giving to these human productions a species of canonisation, they have been the instruments of Divine Providence for bringing them down from their unlawful elevation, and for reinstating the pure Word of God in the place to which it belongs.

(5.) If it is highly detrimental to the adoration due to God alone, that the Roman Pontiffs canonise men and women that they may be invoked, it is equally detrimental to God, and to the submission due to Him, that the same Pontiffs have presumed to place the books of men in the canon of the sacred oracles.

SECTION THIRD.

THE ALLEGATIONS OF THE DEFENDERS OF THE DECREE.

493. It will, no doubt, be asked, What do the defenders of the decree allege to justify this pernicious novelty?

First of all, they produce, 108 years before the Council of Trent, their Pope Eugenius IV. and his Council of Florence, (1439,) to which they attribute an analogous decree. Secondly, they assert that Eugenius IV. received this canon from Pope Gelasius, who occupied the see nearly a thousand years before him, (492–496.) Thirdly, that Gelasius, in his turn, had received it from Augustin and the Council of Carthage, held in the presence of that father one hundred years before Gelasius, (397.) And, in the last place, fourthly, that the Council of Carthage had itself received it either from Pope Innocent, or from Pope Damasus, who ascended the pontifical throne only thirty years before the Council was held.

494. "See, then!" exclaims, on this subject, Bishop Cosin, (art. 196;) "see all the authorities to which they can pretend in the long course of ages that have elapsed since the composition of the apocryphal books! And what are these authorities? Besides, that some are uncertain, and others perverted from their meaning, so that none of them was ever taken, during all preceding ages in the absolute acceptation to which the partizans of the Council wish to extend them, I do not hesitate to say that they are unable to justify their anathema by any of these authorities. For though they may meet, after the days of Augustin, with *two* or *three* writers, who, like him, have enumerated the Scriptures in-

distinctly, as he has done, they will never be able to find that in this nomenclature any of them has declared the *ecclesiastical* books to be *equal* to the *canonical*, either as to their nature or their authority, nor that Gelasius or even Eugenius (supposing these pretended decrees which they offer us under their name, are historically true) ever pronounced an ANATHEMA against whosoever should not abandon the ancient canon for the new. And yet, every man subject to the Church of Rome is bound to *believe* in relation to the apocryphal books, not only that he is permitted to read them in public for the instruction of the Church in life and manners, (which the ancient fathers have often said,) but that he must, *under pain of eternal damnation*, hold them in all their parts (*cum omnibus suis partibus*) as possessing an authority equal to that of the oracles of God to establish doctrine, and to be a foundation of faith, (*extra hanc fidem nemo potest esse salvus.*" (Art. 195.)

495. We take up, in the order of antiquity, these authorities to which the defenders of Rome appeal, and, first of all, we say, as to Pope Innocent, that there are the strongest reasons for putting his pretended epistle to Exuperius [1] in the class of those false decretals of which Rome herself has recognised the fraud. The following are Cave's reasons for rejecting it:—"I hold," he says, "this pretended decree to be false. First, On account of its barbarous style. Secondly, For its absurd accommodations of Holy Writ. Thirdly, For its many errors of doctrine, which yet do not belong to that age. Fourthly, For its very gross errors of chronology. Fifthly, For certain rites it mentions which were not yet prevalent in the Church. Papebroch himself (*Catal. Rom. Pont.*, p. 62) confesses that the errors in chronology of a great number of the epistles attributed to this Pope, oblige him to call them in question." [2]

496. But we shall be more fully convinced of the fraud if we listen to Cosin, because he lays open its origin.

"Never," he says, "was anything said about this pretended epistle of Innocent in any ecclesiastical author till 300 years after

[1] Councils by Binius, tom. i., sect. vii. This is the 3rd Epistle; but the twenty-three first are held by the Magdeburg Centuriators, Osiander, Tillemont, and many others, to be forgeries.

[2] See Dupin, Hist. Eccl., iii., 67. Fabricius, Bibl. Mediae et Infimae Latinit., vol. iv., lib. x., p. 56. 1734-1756.

him. Whence it was taken to be inserted afterwards in the collection of the councils among the *decretal epistles* of the Popes in the Roman code, which itself had for a long time been used in the Church before this letter was slipt in.'[1]

For more than a hundred years nothing was said about any epistle of Innocent in the Roman code;[2] and it was only 200 years after the arrival of Dionysius Exiguus at Rome, (that is to say, 300 years after Innocent,) that at last an abridgment of the canons (*Breviarium Canonum*) was made in 698, and that Cresconius added to the code of Dionysius Exiguus the *Decretal Epistles* of six Popes, among others, those of Innocent and Gelasius. And, what is still more remarkable, even then the pretended *Third Epistle of Innocent to Exuperius* contained nothing of what has been seen in it later as to the *canon of the Scriptures!*

It was, then, 100 years after Cresconius, or 400 years after Innocent, that Isidore the merchant (in the year 800) made a collection of *Decretal Epistles*, such as no honest man would have been disposed at first to make use of, till at last Popes Leo IV. (in 850) and Nicholas I., (in 860,) seeing the great advantages they could gain from them, published them as a law.

497. What will prove still further that this decree is a fraud, is, that the Council of Carthage, uncertain about its own resolutions, decided to consult the bishops beyond sea, and among others, Pope Boniface. But he occupied the see only sixteen years after Innocent. Can any one believe that the council would thus have consulted him had there been in existence a decree of Innocent only fourteen years before?

We believe that we need not stop at the decree that has been attributed sometimes to Pope Damasus, because it is fully admitted that the decretals anterior to Pope Sericius must be classed among the *False Decretals*, but we will say a few words about that attributed to Gelasius.[3]

[1] Codex Canonum and Decretorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ. Edit. Mentz, 1525.

[2] Ferrand at the same time made an abridgment, (*Breviatio Canonum*,) where he cites, as to the collection of the Holy Scriptures, only the decrees of Laodicea and Carthage.

[3] This decree is found in some manuscripts with some illegal alterations attributed to Pope Hormisdas.—*Alzog. Hist. Eccl.*, § 130.

498. In the *Code of the Canon of the Ancient Roman Church*, (Mentz, 1525, and Paris, 1609,) we have a single decree of Pope Gelasius, divided into twenty-eight sections; though subsequently, in the *Volumes of the Councils*, a great number have been added, and, among others, one which had been made at Rome in a council of seventy bishops,[1] on the distinction between the sacred and authentic books, and the Apocrypha.

But of this pretended decree there is no mention whatever in history before the days of the too famous *Isidore the merchant*, that is to say, before the time when Pope Gelasius had been for 300 years laid in his tomb. And it was from this forger of decretals that Burckhard, first of all, in 1014, then Yves in 1117, then at last Gratian in 1180, received the decree of Gelasius, and that of his pretended Roman council held in 494. And yet they received it with so many discrepancies, the "Roman Emendators" themselves, in their *Notes on the Canon of Gratian*, knew not what text to adopt, some of the copies not naming the book of Judith, nor the second book of Maccabees; some mentioning five books of Solomon, and some only two, and some three; others three books of Chronicles, and others only one.

"However, that may be, I hold this pretended decretal to be false," says the learned Dr Cave,[2] "for the following reasons:— 1. Because the most ancient manuscripts do not attribute it to any certain author, and Baluze himself confesses that the real author is not known; 2. Because it refers to books which had not seen the light in 494; 3. Because it contains absurdities and contradictions which we know not how to attribute either to Gelasius or to the council; 4. Because it condemns the *Apostolic Canons* which Dionysius Exiguus, an admirer of Gelasius, and almost his contemporary, translated into Latin, and caused to be received by the Church of Rome; 5. Because it professes to follow St Jerome in everything, and we are well acquainted with the opinions of this father; 6. Because no person ever mentioned it before the year 840; 7. Lastly, because Dionysius Exiguus, who

[1] In Binius, tom. iii.:—"Concil. Romanum quo a 70 Episcopis, libri sacri et authentici ab Apocryphis sunt discreti, sub Gelasio., an. Dom., 494."

[2] Hist. Litter., tom. i., p. 463. See also Bishop Pearson, (Vindiciæ Ignatianæ, i., cap. 4, p. 45–47.)

collected (so short a time after the death of Gelasius) these decretals of the Roman Pontiffs, has, nevertheless, made no mention of this."

To proceed, then, we come to the first testimony which seems to have any historical weight, that of the Council of Carthage, said to have been held in 397, and at which we are assured that Augustin himself was present.

499. As to the Council of Carthage held in the days of Augustin, and which is said to have joined the Apocrypha to the twenty-two sacred books of the Jews, we have already spoken at length in the first part of this work.

We quote the Latin words attributed to the Council:—"CANON XLVII.—Item placuit, ut praeter *Scripturas canonicas* nihil in Ecclesiâ legatur sub nomine *Divinarum Scripturarum*. Sunt autem *canonicæ Scripturæ*, Genesis. . . . . *Salomonis libri quinque*. . . . . *Tobias, Judith—Maccabæorum libri duo* . . . . Hoc etiam fratri et sacerdoti [1] nostro Bonifacio vel aliis earum partium episcopis,[2] pro confirmando isto canone innotescat quia [3] *à* patribus ista accepimus *in ecclesiâ legenda*.—Liceat etiam legi *Passiones Martyrium*, cum anniversarii dies eorum celebrantur."

But we reply, that this decretal, about which the Roman doctors have made so much noise,[4] is very far from having the name, or even the meaning, which they would assign to it; and for the eight following reasons:—

500. (1.) In the tradition relative to the Council of Carthage, so many uncertainties and contradictions prevail, that its testimony is very much weakened, and it is impossible not to recognise in the account we have received of it more than one pious fraud; for example:—

(*a.*) The authors of the decretal resolved that this forty-seventh canon should be communicated to their brother and colleague Boniface; while, in the forty-eighth, they desire that their brethren, *Siricius* and *Simplicius*, should be consulted, the one the bishop

[1] Others, as Binius, say, "Consacerdoti nostro."

[2] The oldest manuscript (Binius and Labbe say) reads—"De confirmando isto canone transmarina ecclesiâ consultetur."

[3] In the sense of "Innotescat quod," ("qua pro quod," according to the African usage.)

[4] Baronius, Annales, 397 and 419. Binius, in notes ad Conc. Carthagin. III. Card. du Perron, his reply, chap. 48, in 1622.

of Rome, and the other of Milan. All the editions of the council bear on the inscription that it was held in 397, (*Caesario et Attico consulibus.*) Now, between the papacy of Siricius and of Boniface there were more than twenty years; the first having ended his only one year after the council was held, and the other not having commenced till 418, after three other popes had occupied the see between these two. The pretended decretal on the Apocrypha, if it was ever passed at the African council, would not have been till twenty-one or twenty-five years after the other canons with which it is associated, and after the council to which it is attributed,—a council, the historians say, composed of forty-four bishops, and presided over by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage.

It follows inevitably that, if this decretal is not a mere fiction, it has been placed there at second-hand, much later, by some ecclesiastical compiler who numbered it at his leisure, and for a certain purpose.

(*b.*) Cardinal Baronius himself, incapable of justifying their contradictions, tells us, that the forty-nine canons attributed to this council must have been decreed by different councils.[1]

(*c.*) "Although this council," says Foye, (*Romish Rites*, 1851, p. 40,) "has no right to the age that is ascribed to it, we know that the most ancient notice which has reached us of its decrees on ordination (can. 1, 2, 3) is of the seventh century, by Isidore of Seville."

(*d.*) The Greek report of the Council of Carthage does not contain the Maccabees in its catalogue of adopted books, "which leads us to think that the Jesuit Labbe completed it in this form as he pleased, when compiling his "History of Councils."[2]

501. (2.) Many suppose that if this decree has been really passed, it will be in the twenty-fourth canon of another council, which is contained in the *Code of the Canons of the African Church*, and which was held in 419, before the death of Boniface. But this explanation resolves no difficulties, and obliterates no contradictions; for neither in the *Greek Code* nor in the *African*

[1] See Westcott's explanation of this confession, in his work on the canon, pp. 508–510.

[2] In the Code of the Canons of the African Church by Cresconius, an African bishop of the seventh century, the book of Maccabees is not named when he reports this Canon. See Justel., "Code des Canons de l'Eglise d'Afrique."

Code, given by Cresconius, do we find the same books mentioned as in the Roman edition. There is no mention either of the Maccabees or of Baruch. And, on the other hand, as they followed in Africa, before the labours of Jerome, a Latin translation of the Septuagint, they received the additions made by the Hellenists, and, among others, the apocryphal book which the Greeks call the *first of Esdras*, and the Latins the *third*. Rejected by the latter, it was recommended by the Council of Carthage, (according to the African Code,) to be read in the assemblies of the African Church.

502. (3.) This decree of Carthage, very far from being able to be an authority with the doctors of Rome, has, on their own shewing, manifestly erred on the question of the Apocrypha, since it rejects *Baruch*, which was adopted by the Council of Trent, and attributes *five books* to Solomon, (*Salomonis libri quinque*,)—that is to say, not only Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and Canticles, but also Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, composed 700[1] years after the royal prophet.

503. (4.) More than this: Even granting credit to the council (whichever it might be) which passed this decree, it is evident that its members never had in their thoughts, nor adopted any resolution which could concern the universal Church, not even (as far as relates to the province of Africa) to form an infallible catalogue of the sacred books. On the contrary, distrusting itself, fearful of some error, it determined that the resolutions should be submitted to the church beyond the sea, ("*transmarina ecclesia consultetur*,") and to different bishops of the west, ("*vel aliis earum partium episcopis.*") It did not submit them solely to the Bishop of Rome; and even its twenty-sixth canon contains this remarkable sentence against the already growing pretensions of the Roman see—"That the bishop of the first see be not called *prince of priests*, or *sovereign priest*, or *anything like it*; but simply, *bishop of the first see.*"

504. (5.) Moreover, it is equally evident, that the council in its decree intended by no means to designate these books as inspired by terming them *canonical Scriptures*, or *Scripturae regulares*,

[1] Augustin, in his "City of God," xvii., 20, acknowledges that the language of his time was erroneous. "Propter eloquii non nullam similitudinem ut *Salomonis dicantur* obtinuit consuetudo. *Non autem esse ipsius* non dubitant doctores."

—(that is to say, serving as a *rule* for the Christian life.) It simply called by this name those books which might be read with edification in the public services. We shall very soon perceive that this was the only point which the decree had in view. Its very language attests that it was not a decree relating to doctrine, but simply a rule of discipline respecting *the books to be read* in the assemblies of the churches, (*in ecclesiâ legenda.*) In the second place, this will appear more evident from the fact, that the council determined that, to the reading of these books might be also joined that of the *Acts of the Martyrs* on the anniversaries of their death. Lastly, to convince yourself, you have only to consider what was constantly the language of Augustin, after this council, where it is asserted that he was present. He never once appealed in his writings to the decisions of this assembly, as putting an end to all uncertainty on the subject of the canon. He does not even mention it.

505. (6.) The council in its decree calls these books *canonical* (that is to say, *serving as a rule*) in the sense in which others call them *ecclesiastical*, in opposition to books *forged*, and unworthy of confidence. And what proves it, is the thought expressed by Augustin when, in his work *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*,[1] he distinguishes the terms "Divine Scripture" and "Canonical Scripture," as we shall presently shew.[2]

506. (7.) "Let us not forget that the Council of Carthage was neither approved nor even named by the General Council of Chalcedon in 451, while that great assembly of 630 bishops formally recognised the Council of Laodicea, held for all Asia Minor thirty years before that of Carthage, and with greater celebrity. We know that Laodicea set forth a catalogue of the Sacred Writings from which the apocryphal books were absolutely excluded. Many doctors of Rome have vainly endeavoured to establish that the Council of Carthage was named in the oecumenical assembly of Chalcedon; but it was never brought forward there, and nothing was done but to confirm in a general manner *preceding decisions*, that is to

[1] Lib. ii., vol. iii., part i., p. 4. Edit. Paris, 1836:—"Erit igitur *divinarum Scripturarum* solertissimus indagator, qui primo totas legerit . . . . et si nondum intellectu jam tamen lectione duntaxat eas quae appellantur canonicae."

[2] See Prop. 510.

say, either the first sessions of the council itself, or what was called *The Universal Code of the Councils*, which appellation referred to nine preceding councils, of which Carthage never made a part.

507. (8.) Lastly, what shews more strongly still in what sense the resolutions passed by the Council of Carthage were understood, is what took place at the end of the seventh century at the sixth *General Council* held at Constantinople 681, and *in Trullo* 692, and composed of 227 bishops. At the same time that it solemnly confirmed, in its second canon, the *Council of Laodicea*, as well as the canonical epistles of St Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and of Amphilochius, which all exclude the apocryphal books from the Holy Scriptures, it likewise recognises the Council of Carthage. It necessarily follows that nothing was seen in the decree of Carthage relating to books for reading in the church, but a measure of discipline consistent with the decree passed at Laodicea.

508. But there remains *Augustin*,[1] the only author of weight, whom, with any appearance of reason, the defenders of Rome can allege in the fifteen first centuries to justify their decree. We shall very soon perceive that if this great doctor sometimes held language which betrayed lax and ill-defined notions respecting the true basis of the canon—if once or twice he has seemed to give the apocryphal books a name and a place to which they have no right—at the same time, the whole tenor of his writings testifies strongly that he never ceased to place an essential difference between these books and the oracles of God, as between their authors and the true prophets, (*proprie prophetas.*)[2] His language —while indicating, in respect of certain books, the uncertainty in which for a time he was left by the Septuagint, of which exclusive use was made in Africa, instead of the original Hebrew,[3] and in which the greater part of the apocryphal books were found bound

[1] See the testimonies of this father on this subject. Kirchhofer, Geschichte der Canons; Wordsworth on the Canon, appendix, 1848, pp. 34, 81; Cosin, No. 87, &c.

[2] De Doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. ii., art. xii.

[3] See the dissertation of Jerome and of Augustin in the 78th and 93rd epistle of the latter, and also the "City of God," xviii., 43.

up with the Holy Scriptures of God,[1]—his language, we say, is very far removed from ever authorising that of the Council of Trent.

For (*a.*) in the seventeenth book of his *City of God* he declares of the Apocrypha, and particularly of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, that it is chiefly in the West that they are received as having authority, ("*eas tamen in auctoritatem maxime occidentalis recepit Ecclesia.*") He would never speak thus of the true oracles of God.

(*b.*) He adds, that we cannot venture to employ with the same confidence against opponents the books which, like these two, are not found in the canon of the Jews, ("*Sed adversus contradictores non tantâ firmitate proferuntur quae scripta non sunt in canone Judaeorum.*")

(*c.*) He acknowledges that the Jews had no prophets beyond the time of the explusion of Tarquin, that is to say, the five hundred and ninth year before Jesus Christ.[2]

In the twenty-fourth chapter of the same book, he says, "During all the time that elapsed since their return from Babylon, (after Haggai, Malachi, and Zechariah, who prophesied at that time,) the Jews had no prophets till the coming of our Lord, excepting Zecharias, the father of John the Baptist, Elisabeth, Anna, and the aged Simeon."

It is sufficiently evident that a writer who holds this language would judge that books written at a period when there was no more prophets in Israel could not belong to the canon of the Divine Scriptures, nor possess the authority of inspired books.

(*d.*) See what he says in his *City of God*, book xviii., ch. 38. He declares (on Ps. lvi.) that all the *scriptures which have prophesied of Jesus Christ are in the hands of the Jews, and that the Jews professed all these same scriptures.* ("*Quia omnes ipsae litterae quibus Christus prophetatus est apud Judaeos sunt omnes ipsas litteras habent Judaei.*")

(*e.*) He takes care to say of the book of Maccabees that it is

[1] Theodotian, who, it appears, first collected these books, and had them appended to the Scriptures in one volume.

[2] "Supputatio temporum, restituto Templo, non in Scripturis sanctis quae *canonicae* appellantur, sed IN ALIIS invenitur, in quibus sunt et Maccab. libri." —*Civ. Dei.*, xviii., 36.

not found in the Holy Scriptures which are called *canonical*—"That the Jews do not receive it, but that the Church can receive it not uselessly, provided it be read and heard with sobriety."[1] Who would dare to speak thus of a book truly divine?

(*f.*) He says likewise of the book of Judith that it is not received by the Jews into the canon of the Scriptures—"(*Quae conscripta sunt in libro* Judith *sane in canonem Scripturarum Judaei non recepisse decantur.*)"[2] And in chap. 38 he gives the reason this people had for not receiving such books—"*Non inveniuntur in canone quem populus Dei recepit.*"[3]

(*g.*) He observes many times, that though prophets were numerous among the Israelites, only the writings of a few of them have been left to us as canonical.[4]

(*h.*) He often lays it down as a principle that *the Jews have been divinely chosen to receive the deposit of the oracles of God*, and that this people have always known how to recognise the true authors of the Holy Scriptures, and to distinguish them from others, that they have always been unanimous on this subject, never having had a difference of opinion on any book, &c. ("*Sed concordes inter se atque in nullo dissentientes sacrarum litterarum veraces ab eis cognoscebantur et tenebantur auctores.*") (Chap. 44 of the same book.)

(*i.*) He often repeats that the Jews are admirably constituted by God to be, in reference to the very Scriptures that condemn them, our book-porters, our librarians, our archive-keepers—"*capsarii nostri*," (on Ps. xl.;) "*librarii nostri*," (on Ps. lvi.;) "*scriniaria nostra.*"

(*k.*) He goes further, and more than once repeats that the Jews have themselves ALL the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, and that "in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, we have all the canonical authorities of the holy books," (Ps. xl. and lvi.)

[1] "Sed recepta est ab Ecclesia non enubiliter, si sobrie legatur vel audiatur."—*Contra Epist. Gaudent.*, lib. ii., 23.

[2] City of God, xviii. 29.

[3] "Cujus rei fateor, causa me latet—nisi quod ego existimo etiam ipsos quibus ea quae in auctoritate religionis, esse deberent, Sanctus ubique Spiritus revelebat, alia sicut homines historica diligentia, alia sicut prophetas inspiratione divinâ scribere potuisse illa ad ubertatem cognitionis haec ad religionis auctoritatem pertinebant, in quâ auctoritate custoditur CANON."

[4] "Qui cum multi fuerent *paucorum* et apud Judaeos et apud nos *canonica Scripta* retinentur."—*City of God*, xviii., 26.

And in the sixteenth chapter *On the Unity of the Church*, "Let them shew," he says, "their church in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms,—that is to say, in all the canonical authorities of the Scriptures. (Demonstrent ecclesiam suam in praescripto LEGES, in PROPHETARUM praedictis, PSALMORUM cantibus; hoc est *in omnibus canonicis librorum auctoritatibus.*)"

509. It will certainly be granted, that such language on the part of that one of all the fathers who, according to the doctors of Rome, speaks most favourably of the Apocrypha, is very far from authorising the decree of the Council of Trent, which makes no difference whatever in authority, importance, or divinity, between these books and the oracles of God intrusted to the Jewish people, and which, on the other hand, pronounces a horrible anathema against "every person who will not receive them all entire, with all their parts, as sacred and canonical."[1]

Let us not be misunderstood. If we dwell at length on these opinions of Augustin, it is only that we may leave no refuge to the defender of that pernicious decree, for, after all, they do not affect our argument on the canon. That father was evidently not well settled on the question; but yet he was infinitely far from speaking as the doctors of the council have done eleven centuries after him. But had he gone much farther in the direction of the errors which a long time after were reduced to a formula at Trent, and caused the Latins to fall into this unfortunate schism, what, after all, would that signify to us?

Neither the one nor the other belong to Israel; and to Israel alone the oracles of the Old Testament have been intrusted. "And truly," (a distinguished man lately wrote to us on this subject,)[2] "I can say that I could scarcely wish that these ancient errors on the Apocrypha in the Latin Church had not been committed. This seemed necessary to establish that the Jewish canon is for us everything or nothing."

510. We think it our duty to quote here that of all the passages of Augustin which can be regarded as the most favourable to the

[1] The bull of Pius IV., given at the end of the council, as a summary of its faith, expressly says, "Extra hanc fidem nemo potest esse salvus."

[2] It gratifies the author to mention that, before sending these sheets to press, he had the happiness to receive the corrections and opinions of three most valued friends, the Pastor Burnier, and the Professors Merle and Binder.

errors of the council, and which the Roman doctors most frequently adduce. It is in Book II., ch. viii. of his *Christian Doctrine*, (vol. iii., part i., p. 47, edit. Paris, 1836.)

"Art. XII. Let a man who is attached to the study of the *Divine Scriptures* begin with reading all, and with knowing them as a whole, if not by understanding, yet by reading them. I speak only of those which are called *canonical*.[1] As for the canonical, let him follow the course I am going to mark out. Let him prefer (*praeponat*) those which are recognised by the catholic churches to those which some do not receive; and among those which are not received by all, let him prefer which the greater number and the most respectable acknowledge, (*plures gravioresque*,) to those which have in their favour only a very few churches, and of little authority, (*pauciores, minoresque auctoritatis*.)

"Art. XIII. Now the entire canon of the Scriptures," he adds, "in reference to which we offer these remarks, is composed of the following books:—(*His libris continetur*,) The five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, the two of Chronicles. There are others of a different class, such as Job, *Tobit*, Esther, *Judith*, *two of the Maccabees*, and two of Esdras; then the Prophets, among which are the Psalms, three books of Solomon, (Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes;) for those two books named *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus* are said to be *Solomon's*, though they may be by *Sirach*,[2] and yet they have deserved to receive authority, and to be counted among the prophetic writings. The others are the books of men properly called prophets; these are the *twelve prophets*, which are only reckoned for one; and, lastly, the four *great prophets*, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. In these forty-four books, the authority of the Old Testament is included. (*His quadraginta quatuor libris Testamenti Veteris terminatur auctoritas*.)"

511. We see, therefore, that even in this passage, where he is more favourable to the Apocrypha than in his other writings, Augustin makes a difference between what he calls *divine writings* and the books *canonical*. He distinguishes his whole catalogue

[1] Observe that he distinguishes between the *divine* Scriptures and the *canonical* Scriptures.

[2] Augustin (Retract., ii., 4) declares that the author of Ecclesiasticus is *uncertain*.

into different categories, according to which certain books were received by all the churches, or by some only; and, lastly, he recommends that all these precautions should be taken in relation to the entire canon by every able investigator (*solertissimus indagator*) of the Divine Scriptures. (*Totus autem canon Scripturarum in quo istam considerationem versandam dicimus.*)"

512. Let us here recall the judicious reflections on this father by Cardinal Cajetan, who died (as we have said) so short a time before the opening of the council. At the end of his commentary on Esther, after having called to mind that all our apocryphal books are excluded from the canon of Jerome, he adds, "Do not allow yourselves to be troubled by the novelty (*ne turberis novitie*) if you find somewhere these books numbered with the canonical, for everything which councils or doctors have been able to say upon them must be brought under Jerome's file, (*ad Hieronymi limam reducenda sunt tam verba conciliorum quam doctorum.*) According to Jerome, these books are *not canonical*, that is, not proper to *serve as a rule* for matters of faith, (*hoc est*, regulares *ad firmandum ea quæ sunt fidei*,) but only to edify the faithful, and authorised for this purpose to be in the canon of the Bible, (*utpote in canone Bibliae ad hoc recepti et auctorati.*) By means of this distinction you will be able to discriminate both the words of Augustin in his work on *Christian Doctrine*, and what is written in the provincial councils of Florence, Carthage, and Laodicea," &c.

513. The error of Augustin and his contemporaries in Africa before the light of Jerome's labours had extended so far, consisted solely in too easily joining to the Old Testament books more or less doubtful, even in their own judgment. While, on the contrary, the error of the Council of Trent consisted in assimilating entirely these doubtful books to the sacred oracles—in declaring them infallibly divine—in taking no account of the testimony of the Jews, to whom alone these holy oracles had been intrusted; and, still further, in solemnly anathematising whoever feared to be guilty of the same profanation. So atrocious an act was never perpetrated!

514. Lastly, to all these testimonies of Innocent, Gelasius, Augustin, and the Council of Carthage alleged by the defenders

of the Council of Trent, we can reply, by a very simple fact, to which we have already alluded. What proves that during eleven or twelve hundred years, I mean from Augustin to the Council of Trent, there was a general agreement throughout the West with Jerome and with us, is, that in this long space of time, a Bible was never seen which bore on its front either the pretended Epistle of Innocent, or the pretended decretal of Gelasius, or the pretended decretal of Florence, or the Catalogue of Carthage; while in all the Bibles, manuscript or printed, the "Prologus Galeatus" of Jerome was placed on the first page by the constant and unanimous consent of the Latin Church, in order to attest that it maintained with him the distinction between the *apocryphal* or *ecclesiastical* books, and the *canonical.*

515. There remains nothing more to examine here, in reply to the defenders of the Apocrypha, excepting a pretended decree of a council said to be universal, held at Florence in 1439, during the twenty-fourth and last schism of the Roman Church. Between the decree attributed to the Council of Carthage, and the too famous decree of Trent, there were 1149 years, and yet, says Cosin, the only council that the Jesuits, in this long interval have attempted to allege, is that of Florence, which the Council of Bâle, then assembled, declared to be "*only a schismatic synagogue.*"

They cite, as issued by this council, a catalogue of the Scriptures perfectly similar to that of the Council of Carthage. But it is easy to demonstrate, and this Cosin [1] has done, that this is only a very late forged decree, of which we owe the first publication to Caranza,[2] who died 137 years after the Council of Florence, *at which not a single word was said of the canon.*

516. To ascertain the fraud, it will be sufficient to hear the

[1] Among the Acts of the Council there is an instruction to the Armenians, dated the 10th of the calends of December, that is to say, five months after the Armenians had quitted Florence. But even *in this instruction*, says Cosin, according to all the great collections of the Councils, (Crabb, Surius, Nicolinus, and Binius,) there is not a word about the canon. Not more than 100 years after Caranza published an Abridgment of the Councils, and in that the instruction appeared with three new articles, where a catalogue similar to that of Carthage was inserted. (See Keerl, De Apocryphis, p. 150.)

[2] Dominican, confessor to Queen Mary, and Archbishop of Toledo.

language of men who were either actors at the Council of Florence or contemporaries.

Antoninus, for example, took a part in it. He was afterwards created archbishop of that city, and was canonised at Rome under Adrian VI. Now, Antoninus declares, in his *Summary of History*,[1] that Ecclesiasticus is not *authentic* so as to serve for proof in matters of faith—that the Hebrews reckon in all only twenty-two authentic books—that they call the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees, *apocryphal;* but that the Church, notwithstanding, receives the apocryphal books as *true, useful,* and *moral,* though, for controversy relative to the faith, they are not to be urged as argument, ("*et si in contentione eorum quae sunt fidei, non urgentia ad arguendum.*") And in his *Summary of Theology* he produces, to support his opinion, Jerome, Thomas Aquinas, and Nicholas de Lyra, and concludes that the Apocrypha may have the same authority as the opinions of the holy doctors, which are approved by the Church. ("*Unde forte habent auctoritatem talem qualem habent dicta S. Doctorum approbata ab Ecclesiâ.*")

517. We may cite again in the same period the celebrated Tostatus, bishop of Alcala, the most learned man of his age, (*stupor mundi,* as he was called,) who died only fifteen years after the Council of Florence. In his *Commentaries* he frequently excludes the *six apocryphal books* from the number of the *canonical books proper to prove the faith,* and declares that the Church, though it retains them, does not absolutely enjoin that they should be read or accepted, and does not condemn persons who do not receive them as disobedient or infidels. ("*Licet ab Ecclesiâ teneantur, in canone tamen non ponuntur quia non adhibet illis ecclesia hanc fidem; nec jubet illos regulariter legi aut recipi, et non recipientes non judicat inobedientes aut infideles.*")[2]

518. Lastly, the same Pope Eugenius to whom this false decree of Florence has been attributed said of Dionysius the Carthusian, another of his contemporaries, equally decided against the apocryphal books, "*Laetetur mater Ecclesia quae talem habet filium.*" Now, this son of the Church, who was to give so much joy to his

[1] Summa Hist., part i., tit. iii., cap. iv. and cap. vi. sect. xii.

[2] Praef. in Matt. ix. 1.

mother, Dionysius the Carthusian, said of the apocryphal books, "That they are no part of the canon; and that, if the Church causes them to be read, it is not to confirm doctrines, but to form manners. (*Non ad confirmationem dogmatum; sed ad morum informationem.*")[1] "The book of Maccabees," he also said, "is not in the canon, although it is received by the Church as a true book. (*Tamen ab Ecclesiâ tanquam verus receptus est.*)"[2]

519. It is, then, well established that when the Church of Rome, on the 13th of April 1546, in its general council of fifty persons, under the influence of Catharin and his faction, hastened to draw up a new additional canon of the Holy Scriptures, and so join to it the body of traditions, as not less infallible than the oracles of the living God, it committed this twofold evil, in spite of the testimony rendered by the universal Church in all ages, and made this canon, by its own avowal, for the purpose of establishing the dogmas which the famous bull of Pius IV.[3] was going to add to the ancient profession of faith, touching the sovereignty of the Church of Rome, and touching purgatory, the seven sacraments, transubstantiation, the withholding the cup, the invocation of saints, relics, images, and indulgences. "Let all persons, therefore, understand," said the council, "in what order, and in what way this synod is about to proceed, after laying the foundation of the confession of faith; and also what testimonies, and what defences, it will use for confirming doctrines and correcting manners in the Church."[4]

[1] Prol. in Tobiam. [2] Cap. i.

[3] Super forma Sacramenti Professionis fidei. (Sub finem Concil. Trid.)

[4] "Omnes itaque intelligent quo ordine et via ipsa synodus POST FACTUM fidei confessiones FUNDAMENTUM sit progressura, et quibus potissimum testimoniis et praesidiis in confirmandis dogmatibus et instaurandis in Ecclesiâ moribus, sit usura."

THE END.

apocrypha, admited into the canon 1200 years later by the Council of Trent. The arguments of the Romanists on this point have been very powerfully combated by Bishop *Cosin*:—

1. "*Dionysius the Little*," say the Romanists, "has omitted the catalogue in his translation of the 'Universal Code of Canons.'"

But Dionysius the Little is known to have made many other alterations and omissions.

2. Neither does the *Roman code*, they add, contain it.

But it is to the Greeks rather than to the Latins, to the *Universal Code*, rather than to the *Roman Code*, that we must appeal. The latter omits, in like manner, eight canons of the Council of Ephesus, the last three of the Council of Constantinople, and the last two of the Council of Chalcedon.

Besides, says Cosin, the fraud betrays it through a singular oversight. In discarding from the 59th canon of Laodicea the catalogue of canonical Scriptures, its *preface* and *title* have been inadvertently retained, and these make a manifest allusion to the books enumerated further on in all other editions of the Council. Those published by *Mercator*, *Merlin*, *Crab*, *Surius*, *du Tillier*, *Binnius*, as well as those published by *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, all contain the catalogue omitted in the *Roman Code*.[1]

3. *Catharin*, to evade the testimony of the decree of Laodicea, has recourse, on the contrary, to the supposition that the catalogue was originally more extended, and that the apocryphal books had been subsequently omitted. "*Vehementer suspicor*," says he; "I strongly suspect."

But by such gratuitous conjectures anything could be established and anything overturned.

4. Lastly, *Baronius*, in his "Annales," goes still further. He represents the Council of Laodicea as earlier than that of Nice, and makes the latter pass a decree regarding the Apocrypha.[2] He thus expected to upset the authority of the former by that of the latter, as a General Council can modify the decisions of a Provincial.

But, in the first place, we have already shewn (Theses 52 and 53) that the supposition of a Nicean decree about the book of *Judith* is without foundation.

[1] Codex Canonum et Decretorum Ecclesiæ Romanæ, p. 502.

[2] We do not add a translation, as the substance has been given in Thesis 87.

In the second place, the *Code of the Universal Church*, in reproducing the canons of Laodicea, specifies 364 as the date of the Council.

In the third place, all ancient collections, either Greek or Latin, of the *Synodical Canons* have always placed those of Laodicea *after* those of Antioch, and we know that the Council of Antioch was held sixteen years after that of Nice.

Lastly, the *Photinians* are condemned in the 7th canon of Laodicea. Now, these were first mentioned in 345, that is, twenty years after the Council of Nice.

89. The reader will probably feel an interest in reading the entire decree of Laodicea in the original:—

CANONS LIX. AND LX.[1]

Οτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐδὲ ἀπαύστατα βιβλιά, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.

Ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. ά. Γένεσις κόσμου, β'. Ἔξοδος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, γ'. Λευϊτικόν, δ'. Ἀριθμοί, ε'. Δευτερονόμιον, ς'. Ἰησοῦς Ναυῆ, ζ'. Κριταί. Ῥούθ, ή. Ἐσθήρ, θ'. Βασιλειῶν πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα, ί. Τρίτη καὶ τετάρτη, ιά. Παραλειπόμενα πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ιβ'. Ἔσδρας πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον, ιγ'. Βίβλος ψαλμῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα, ιδ'. Παροιμίαι Σαλομώντος, ιέ. Ἐκκλησιαστής, ις'. Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, ιζ'. Ἰὼβ, ιή. Δώδεκα προφῆται, ιθ'. Ἡσαΐας, κ'. Ἱερεμιάς καὶ Βαρούχ.[2] Θρῆνοι καὶ ἐπιστολαί, κά. Ἰεζεκιήλ, κβ'. Δανιήλ.

Τὰ δὲ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης ταῦτα· Εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα, κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, κατὰ Λουκᾶν, κατὰ Ἰωάννην· Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων, Ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαὶ ἑπτά, οὕτως· Ἰακώβου μία, Πέτρου δύο, Ἰωάννου τρεῖς, Ἰούδα μία. Ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου δεκατέσσαρες· πρὸς Ῥωμαίους μία, πρὸς Κορινθίους δύο, πρὸς Γαλάτας μία, πρὸς Ἐφεσίους μία, πρὸς Φιλιππησίους μία, πρὸς Κολασσαεῖς μία, πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς δύο, πρὸς Ἑβραίους μία, πρὸς Τιμόθεον δύο, πρὸς Τίτον μία, πρὸς Φιλήμονα μία.

---

[1] These are the two last of the canons; but they are numbered 163 and 164 in the *Universal Code*, which contains 207, anterior to the time of Dionysius the Little.

[2] This is no specifying of the apocryphal book of Baruch, but simply an exegetical mode of pointing out more distinctly what, according to the Jews, their twentieth book contained, which we are accustomed to call "*Jeremiah and his Lamentations.*" It was nearly in the same manner that Origen, a hundred years before, had distinguished in detail the same book of Jeremiah, (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., lib. vi., cap. 25;) "*Jeremiah*," said he, "*with his Lamentations and his Epistle* (chap. 30) forms only one book." Athanasius, also, and Cyril, in designating the book of Jeremiah, add, as the Council of Laodicea does, an indication of the contents of chapter 29th, and of what is to be found in Jeremiah about Baruch. (See chapters 32, 36, 43, and 45.) Besides, the meaning of the council's expression became clear from the number *of twenty-two books*, which it carefully retains.

of Constantinople, the last two of Chalcedon, and he added a great number of canons unknown to the Christian Church. Yet, let us remark that, with all these alterations, there appeared no decretal epistle of a pope; so that, for a hundred years, even the *Roman Code* contained no trace of an *Epistle of Innocent*. It was not till 200 years after *Dionysius the Little*, and 300 after *Innocent*, that an abridgement of the Canons, (*Breviarum Canonum*,) drawn up in 689 by *Cresconius*, an African bishop, added to the Code of *Dionysius the Little* the decretal epistles of six popes, and among these an *Epistle to Exuperus*. Even then this pretended *Epistle of Innocent* did not as yet contain his pretended catalogue. It was not till a hundred years after *Cresconius*, or 400 years after Innocent I., that Isidorus Mercator, in the year 800, published his *Collection of Decretals*,—"such a collection," says Cosin, "as no honest man could bring himself to use; and it remained without effect till Pope Leo IV. (in 850) and Pope Nicholas, (in 860,) perceiving the advantage they might derive from these false decretals, promulgated them as law."

We enter into these details here merely to avoid the necessity of recurring to them when we shall have occasion subsequently to speak of the *False Decretals*, and the pernicious use which was made of them in the Apocrypha question.

SECTION II.

CATALOGUE OF DAMASUS.

81. For the same reasons as the preceding we refrain from mentioning, in connexion with the fourth century, the pretended catalogue of *Damasus*,[1] contained in a decree (*De Explanatione Fidei*) said to have been passed under that Pope in a council at Rome, between 366 and 384. That catalogue, agreeing, as to the New Testament, with that of our churches, is introduced in these terms:—"*Nunc vero de Scripturis Divinis agendum est, quid universalis Catholica Ecclesia teneat et quid vitari debeat.*" We regard it as spurious, like that of Innocent, as it is now well ascertained that all the decretals professing to be anterior to Pope

[1] See Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, iv., pp. 187-196.

Syricus (from 384 to 398) are to be classed among the *False Decretals*, which no one, even in the Roman camp, any longer dares to uphold.

SECTION III.

CATALOGUE OF AMPHILOCHIUS.[1]

82. Lastly, as to the catalogue in Greek verse, usually published among the works of Gregory the Divine, (under the title of *Iambi ad Seleucum*,) and often ascribed to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium about the year 380, and of which we have already spoken, (Thesis 61,) we regard it as, at least, apocryphal, if not spurious. Neither its date, nor its author, nor its history, is accurately known. It abounds in metrical faults, and there is no sufficient reason for believing that *Amphilochius* was its author. We possess no authentic work of that bishop so as to be able to institute a comparison. Many have even been inclined to ascribe it to *Gregory of Nazianzus*, as if these Iambics presented to us a second and a poetic expression of his mind on the canon. Whatever is to be concluded regarding the author and origin of this apocryphal catalogue, it comprehends in the *true canon of the inspired Scriptures* all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament; but adds that some *erroneously* (*οὐκ εὖ λέγοντας*) reject the Epistle to the Hebrews, while others do not receive the brief epistles of John and Jude, and that a still greater number of persons do not receive the Apocalypse. After having specified all our twenty-seven books, and only these, the writer concludes thus:—

Οὗτος ἀψευδέστος
Κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων Γραφῶν.

"Let such be held as the true canon of inspired Scriptures."

[1] This is the Amphilochius who, in order to obtain from Theodosius the long-refused decree against the Arians, presented himself one day before the emperor without offering any homage to his son, Arcadius, who sate on a throne beside him. "You are displeased at my irreverence, and with reason. But what must the eternal Father, the King of kings, think of those who refuse to honour His only Son, and who blaspheme His holy name?"—*Sozomen*, bk. vii., chap. ix.

INDEX.

Aben Ezra, 433.
Adler, 21, 23.
Agathon, 582.
Agobard, 639.
Alcuin, 466, 639.
Alexander of Alexandria, 374.
Alexander V., Pope, 512.
Alexandria, Chronicle of, 349.
Alogi, Sect of the, 286, 298.
Ambrose, 287, 304, 321, 349, 393.
Amphilochius, Catalogue of, 45, 52, 67, 70, 95, 313, 336, 345, 349, 361, 637.
Anagnosis, 123–135, 400–404.
Anastasius, 638.
Andreas, 52, 293, 306.
Antioch, Council of, 313.
Antoninus, 638, 661.
Apollonius, 286, 297.
Arethas, 288.
Arnobius, 120, 286, 303.
Asterius Urbanus, 139, 177.
Athanasius, 9, 40, 45, 54–57, 88, 96, 97, 286, 305, 312, 327, 336, 337, 344, 349, 361, 363, 374, 375, 393, 399, 441, 638.
Athenagoras, 177, 367.
Augustin, 54, 64, 81, 89, 96, 287, 304, 308, 321, 322, 323, 336, 349, 361, 374, 458, 470, 479, 493, 516, 550, 571, 607, 638, 645, 646, 652, 653, 654–660.
Augusti, 507.

Bala, 608.
Balsamon, 638.
Barnabas, Epistle of, 241, 367, 552.
Baronius, 44, 75, 322, 534, 535, 651.
Basnage, 87, 472, 541.
Basil, 45, 286, 305, 313, 327, 637.
Basilides, 237, 238.
Baur, 500, 501, 502.
Bede, 639.
Bellarmine, 44, 466, 511, 513, 535, 641.
Bengel, 555.
Bentley, 555.
Berger de Xivray, 24, 229.
Bertholdt, 498, 502, 507.
Beza, 324.
Biedermann, 134.
Bigot, Emeric, 540.
Binder, Professor, 657.
Bingham, 131, 223.
Binius, 44, 81, 647, 649, 660.
Blackmore, 476.
Bleek, 493.
Bonnet, 243, 353.
Bossuet, 562.
Bowring, 464.
Braun, 328.
Bretschneider, 501.
Breviary, 528, 531, 536–538.
Bruce, 387.
Bulls, Papal, 514, 517, 519, 521, 525.
Bunsen, 121, 139, 186, 189, 239, 256, 301, 319, 569.
Burgh, 288.
Burnier, 657.
Buxtorf, 471.

Caius, 112, 286, 298, 320, 373, 567.
Cajetan, 44, 639, 643, 659.
Calmet, 385, 389, 390, 433.

Calvin, 243, 305, 324, 325, 356, 358, 363, 416, 420, 435, 437, 452.
Calovius, 345.
Caranza, 660.
Carpocrates, 238.
Carpsovius, 328.
Carthage, Council of, 71, 79–81, 90, 306, 307, 321, 336, 361, 374, 393, 490, 638, 646, 648, 650–654.
Casalis, 613.
Cassiodorus, 89, 367, 466, 638.
Catechism of the Greek Church, 399, 476, 477.
Catharin, 44, 75, 630, 644, 662.
Cave, Dr W., 27, 65, 68, 223, 230, 235, 237, 245, 248, 301, 631, 647, 649.
Celsus, 211–218.
Cerinthus, 286, 298.
Chrysostom, 112, 212, 254, 304, 306, 313, 327, 349, 393, 540, 638.
Clement of Alexandria, 9, 103, 148–153, 157–162, 235, 238, 259, 286, 295, 297, 315, 317, 324, 328, 344, 366, 373, 381, 386, 391, 400, 405, 552, 553, 638.
Clement of Rome, 240, 254–277, 310, 317, 319, 324, 327, 343, 367, 390, 402, 551, 563, 566.
Clichtoveus, 639, 641.
Cludius, 501, 502, 503.
Code of the Canons, 40, 68, 74, 75, 76, 651.
Confessions of Faith, 416, 604–607.
Constance, Council of, 512.
Constantinople, Council of, 40, 490, 654.
Cosin, Bishop, 68, 69, 74, 75, 81, 388, 468, 632, 637, 644, 646, 647, 660.
Councils, 519, 650, 654, 660.
Credner, 69, 134, 186, 204, 499, 501, 502, 503, 507.
Cresconius, 648, 652.
Crespin, his *History of the Martyrs*, 597–603.
Cureton, 21, 255, 292, 553.
Cyprian, 63, 131, 286, 302, 320, 365, 393, 539.
Cyril, Catalogue of, 48, 49, 88, 96, 97, 286, 293, 305, 361.
Cyril Lucar, 260, 324, 403.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 88, 259, 286, 293, 305, 311, 327, 336, 337, 374, 393, 441, 552, 638.
Damascenus, John, 441, 637.
Damasus, Pope, 67, 69, 646.
Dahl, 503.
Decretals, 69, 527–530, 648.
Delarue, Editor of Origen's Works, 27.
Des Marets, 637.
Didymus of Alexandria, 361, 386, 393.
Diesterdick, 503.
Dietlein, 354, 367, 507.
Diodorus of Tarsus, 313.
Diognetus, Epistle to, 11, 241, 245–247.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 285, 299, 300, 313, 324, 337, 374.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 393.
Dionysius of Corinth, 139, 177.
Dionysius the Little, 69, 75.
Dionysius de Ryckel, 639.
Dobrowski, 558.
Donation of Constantine, 531–533.
Driedo of Louvaine, 639.
Du Perron, 540, 631.
Du Pin, 530, 647.
Du Plessis Mornay, 540.
Durand, 182.

Ebionites, 238, 493.
Ebrard, 507.
Eichhorn, 393, 497, 501, 502, 507.
Elliott, 305, 591.
Ephrem the Syrian, 286, 291, 304, 313, 327, 361, 379, 393.
Epiphanius, 54, 58, 59, 96, 110, 229, 230, 236, 259, 286, 288, 305, 313, 327, 336, 337, 349, 361, 374, 375, 393, 441, 638.
Erasmus, 541, 639, 641.
Estius, 405.
Eugenius, Pope, 646, 661.
Eulalius, 324.
Eusebius, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31–41, 43, 88, 94, 96, 97, 109, 112, 121, 125, 127, 132, 139, 158, 160, 181, 184, 192, 208, 209, 237, 239, 248, 249, 254, 258, 285, 287, 293, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 304, 313, 315, 317, 319, 327, 335, 336, 337, 341, 344, 349, 362, 363, 365, 367, 372, 373, 376, 392, 393, 402, 403, 404, 551, 552, 553, 563, 566, 575, 636.
Ewald, 503.

Fabricius, 389.
Fell, 555.
Ferus, John, 639, 644.

Firmilian, 366.
Fleury, 527, 529, 530, 532.
Florence, Council of, 660, 661.
Foxe the Martyrologist, 600.
Fritzsche, 562.

Gabler, 507.
Gallandi, 245, 259.
Garnier, 533.
Gelasius, Pope, 67, 388, 646, 649.
Gelpke, 507.
George of Venice, 641.
Gerhard, 345.
Gibbon, 118.
Gieseler, 248, 528.
Gnostics, 494.
Gobat, 486.
Goode, 173.
Grabe, 165, 259, 287, 389.
Grant, 486.
Gregory of Nazianzus, 45, 50, 52, 70, 96, 286, 293, 305, 313, 327, 336, 361, 374, 393, 441, 638.
Gregory of Nyssa, 313, 327, 349.
Gretser, 630.
Griesbach, 555, 557, 558, 577.
Grotius, 432.
Guericke, 288, 289, 323, 349, 354, 359, 361, 367, 373, 497, 498, 502, 507.

Hahn, 226.
Haldane, 619.
Hänlein, 496, 507.
Hävernick, 507.
Hefele, 139, 241, 243, 245, 250, 258, 260, 292, 323, 523, 552.
Hegesippus, 22.
Hengstenberg, 433, 507.
Heracleon, 235.
Hertwig, 496, 499, 507.
Herts, 186.
Hilary of Poitiers, 45, 321, 349, 639.
Hippolytus, 9, 220, 286, 293, 298, 301, 319, 566, 569.
Hooght, Van der, 464.
Horne, 468, 636.
Hottinger, 470.
Houbigant, 464.
Huet, 27, 392.
Hug, 21, 25, 48, 129, 134, 219, 291, 298, 323, 341, 552.
Huther, 502.

Ignatius, 9, 11, 240, 254–257, 292, 316, 552.
Index Expurgatorius, 542–546.
Innocent, Pope, 67, 68, 69, 646, 647.
Irenæus, 9, 25, 103, 110, 120, 148, 149, 163–176, 179, 180, 220, 225, 226, 249, 286, 287, 289, 293, 296, 316, 319, 323, 344, 366, 373, 391, 400, 551, 553.
Isidore, 67, 237, 465, 529, 648.

Jacobson, 260.
James, Thomas, 466, 533–545.
Jansenists, 513.
Januarius, 537.
John the Martyr, 132.
Jerome, 10, 22, 44, 45, 54, 60, 61, 62, 96, 110, 112, 287, 304, 308, 311, 316, 320, 321, 323, 324, 327, 336, 337, 349, 358, 361, 374, 375, 393, 403, 435, 441, 465, 470, 550, 552, 553, 561, 563, 566–569, 629, 630, 642, 645, 659.
Josephus, 14, 109, 339, 342, 384, 434, 441, 447, 462, 463, 469, 470, 564, 636.

Julius Africanus, 638.
Junilius, 638.
Justel, 74.
Justin Martyr, 9, 17, 126, 134, 191–207, 227, 286, 295, 366, 403, 637.

Kennicott, 464.
Kern, 502.
Kirchhofer, 80, 151, 155, 159, 207, 212, 213, 226, 228, 239, 284, 291, 341, 347, 364, 390, 654.
Kortholt, 466.

Labbe, 80, 537, 650.
Lachmann, 555, 557, 559.
Lactantius, 286, 302, 493, 578.
La Harpe, 323, 328.
Lange, 503, 507.
Laodicea, Council of, 10, 40, 45, 73–81, 305, 307, 313, 327, 336, 361, 374, 393, 490, 561, 637, 653.
Lardner, 8, 52, 89, 103, 155, 248, 287, 288, 299, 305, 343, 367, 383, 390.
Lawrence, 386, 387, 389.
Le Chassier, 74.
Le Clerc, 87.
Lee, 288.

Le Fevre d'Etaples, 639, 641.
Leger, 585.
Leo, Pope, 648.
Le Sueur, 43, 579, 583.
Lightfoot, 124, 433, 471.
Liguori, 537.
Lucifer, 393.
Lücke, 283, 306, 386, 493, 503.
Lüderwald, 507.
Lumper, 245.
Luther, 324, 345, 593, 603.
Lutteroth, 603.

Macknight, 328.
Malon, 631.
Manuscripts of the Scriptures, 33, 260, 403, 577, 579.
Marcion, 223–230.
Martyr, Peter, 540.
Masora, 472.
Massuet, 223.
Matthaei, 555, 558.
Mayerhoff, 502, 507.
Melito, 139, 286, 296, 637.
Menander, 238.
Merle d'Aubigné, 523, 581, 588, 657.
Methodius, 286, 293, 303.
Meyer, 507.
Michaelis, J. D., 21, 99, 285, 291, 294, 298, 299, 301, 304, 358, 376, 381, 405, 497, 557.
Michaelis, J. H., 464.
Middleton, Bishop, 290, 436.
Mill, 555, 558.
Milner, 576.
Minutius Felix, 120.
Missal, 570.
Mohler, 245.
Moldenhauer, 636.
Moses of Chorene, 121.
Montfaucon, 533.
Morrison, 594.
Moses Stuart, 288, 305, 323, 328.
Muratori, Canon of, 21, 95, 186–190, 296, 320, 366, 373, 391.
Mynster, 552.

Narrative of the Martyrs of Lyons, 295.
Neander, 248, 349, 378, 379, 503, 552.
Neudecker, 499, 502.
Nice, Council of, 42–46, 361, 368, 490.
Nicephorus, 638.
Nott, 186.

Occam, 640.
Olshausen, 168, 205, 284, 388, 433, 502, 507.
Onesimus, 637.
Order of the Books of the New Testament, 24, 56, 57, 59, 61, 65, 80, 180, 188, 225, 229, 337, 378.
Origen, 9, 21, 25–31, 88, 96, 97, 103, 137, 211, 212, 215, 216, 237, 259, 286, 288, 302, 313, 317, 327, 336, 344, 349, 363, 364, 365, 372, 375, 381, 385, 386, 388, 392, 402, 465, 552, 553, 638.
Orosius, 125, 288.
Otto, 134.
Owen, Dr, 325.
Owen, Rev. John, 609, 611.

Pamphilus, 385.
Pantaenus, 139, 316.
Papias, 139, 293, 294, 400.
Pastor (or Shepherd) of Hermas, 241, 291, 343, 367, 390, 553.
Paulus, 503, 507.
Paul de Burgos, 639.
Perrone, 631.
Peshito Version of the New Testament, 21–25, 102, 290, 304, 340, 360, 379, 398.
Philaretus, 476, 516, 521.
Philastrius, 52, 53, 320, 321, 336, 361, 393, 567, 568, 638.
Philo, 441, 462, 636.
Photius, 259, 367.
Picus de Mirandola, 639, 640.
Pinkerton, 477.
Plato, Archbishop of Moscow, 476.
Pliny, 118.
Pocock, 379.
Polycarp, Epistle of, 236, 249–253, 292, 316, 391, 553.
Polycrates, 637.
Possevin, 535, 544.
Pott, 507.
Prideaux, 471.
Primasius, 288.
Prochorus, 288.
Ptolemy, 235, 236.

Reformation, 580.
Reuss, 328, 349, 379, 502, 503, 589.
Rilliet, 558.
Rosenmüller, 464.
Rossi, 464.
Routh, 186.
Rufinus, Catalogue of, 54, 63, 89, 304, 336, 361, 374, 638.

Sanxuen, 291, 304.
Salmasius, 359.
Scaliger, 248, 387.
Schleiermacher, 501, 502.
Schmidt, 496, 502.
Schneckenburger, 501.
Scholz, 131, 555, 559.
Schott, 499, 503, 507.
Schrader, 502.
Schulz, 502.
Schwegler, 204, 502, 503, 507.
Seckendorf, 345.
Semisch, 204, 242.
Semler, 497, 501, 502, 503, 507.
Sennebier, 604.
Serapion, 404.
Seymour, 515.
Sibylline Oracles, 493.
Simon, Richard, 537.
Simon the Magician, 238.
Sinai, Manuscripts from, 577.
Smyrna, Church at, 248.
Spanheim, 323, 328.
Storr, 507.
Strauss, 137.
Suetonius, 125.
Sylvestre de Sacy, 387, 390.
Syncellus, 387, 389.

Tacitus, 118.
Targums, 471
Tatian, 230–232.
Tertullian, 9, 17, 102, 104, 112, 126, 132, 148, 154–157, 184, 204, 225, 229, 233, 237, 253, 281, 286, 287, 297, 319, 322, 344, 375, 391, 397, 455, 638.
Theodoret, 43, 165, 232, 313, 324, 327, 339, 349.
Theodorus of Mopsuestia, 112, 313.
Theophilus of Antioch, 177, 178, 286, 297, 367, 391.
Theophylact, 324, 349.
Thiersch, 25, 38, 84, 105, 122, 130, 134, 138, 291, 354, 400, 404, 507.
Tholuck, 315.
Tilloch, 288.
Tischendorf, 378, 553, 555, 558, 559, 577.
Tittmann, 555, 557.
Titus of Botara, 313.
Tostatus, 639, 661.
Toulouse, Council of, 516, 519.
Tregelles, Dr, 555, 557, 558.
Trent, Council of, 512, 514, 515, 517, 520, 542, 561, 630, 633, 634, 659, 660.
Tyndal, 585–589.

Ullmann, 502, 552
Usher, 254.

Valentine, 232–235.
Valesius, (Henry de Valois,) 31, 294, 362, 367.
Victorinus, 112, 286, 288, 303.
Vives, Louis, 641.
Vogel, 501.
Vulgate, 465, 640.

Walton, 555.
Weber, 502.
Wettstein, 555.
Westcott, 80, 186, 206, 239, 307, 651.
Wette, de, 349, 498, 501, 502, 503, 507.
Whately, Archbishop, 124.
Wickelhaus, 21.
Wieseler, 186, 189.
Wilkinson, 591.
Wiseman, 21, 538.
Winer, 134, 349, 385, 552.
Wordsworth, Dr, 80, 331, 373, 405, 631, 654.
Wotton, 259, 260.

Ximenes, 639, 640.

Yeates, 464.

BALLANTYNE AND COMPANY, PRINTERS EDINBURGH.